DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 326 95 IR 003 590

AUTHOR	Steiger, JoAnn M.
TITLE	Report and Guidelines on Improving the Retrieval of Product Information from ERIC. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc., McLean, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Dissemination and Resources Group.
PUB DATE	Oct 75
CONTRACT	NIE-P-75-0050
NOTE	138p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Abstracting; Codification; Computer Oriented Programs; Indexing; Information Processing; *Information Retrieval; Information Systems; *Input Output Analysis; *Merchandise Information; *Program Descriptions; *Search Strategies; Thesauri; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Educational Resources Information Center; ERIC

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was to provide guidance to ERIC on how to facilitate product information retrieval. Information on practitioner needs, on the use of descriptors and abstracting procedures, and on alternatives for improving the system was gathered and circulated to NIE staff members. The resulting document described three alternative ways of improving access to practitioner oriented documents and presented draft guidelines for writing abstracts. The alternatives were: revising the method of descriptor assignment to produce documents; revising and expanding pubtype codes; and creating a separate system for all products, programs, and practice documents. This document was then sent out to all clearinghouse directors, directors of ERIC search services, and others with a request for comments. The responses were summarized, sample abstracts were developed and six recommendations were made: (1) pubtype codes should be refined, pilot tested, and refined again; (2) inter-clearinghouse inconsistency in indexing and abstracting should be reduced; (3) guidelines for abstracting product information should be agreed upon and entered into the Thesaurus; (4) successful computer search strategies for retrieving product documents should be available to all; (5) existing product information systems should be considered for coordination with ERIC. The above documents are presented in this report along with the responses. (DAG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED135326

Report and Guidelines on Improving the Retrieval of Product Information from ERIC

Final Report

October 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This paper was prepared for the Office of Dissemination and Resources, National Institute of Education, pursuant to Order No. NIE-P-75-0050. Views or conclusions contained in this document should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the National Institute of Education.

JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink & Smith, Inc.

IR003590

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 1

II. "THE ERIC SYSTEM AND PRACTITIONER NEEDS" 8

III. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS 48

APPENDIXES:

A. 1. Letter to Clearinghouse Directors, April 11, 1975

2. Responses from Clearinghouse Directors

B. 1. Written Comments Received on "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs"

2. List of Persons with whom Interviews Were Held

C. Sample Abstracts Based on Draft Guidelines

I. INTRODUCTION
AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this project was to assist the Dissemination and Resources Group (DRG) in providing guidance to ERIC on how to facilitate product information retrieval. To accomplish this, the following tasks were performed:

1. Information was gathered from a variety of sources concerning practitioner needs, the adequacy of currently used descriptors and abstracting procedures, and alternatives for improving the system. Chief among the sources were responses to a letter sent to all clearinghouse directors. (See Appendix A)

2. An interim report was written describing the findings resulting from Task 1, and circulated to NIE staff members.

3. A paper entitled "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs" was developed. This document described three alternative ways of improving access to practitioner oriented documents and presented draft guidelines for writing abstracts.

   The three alternatives discussed were a) revising the system of assigning descriptors to product, program and practice documents; b) revising and expanding the Pubtype codes; c) establishing a separate system for product, program and practice documents. The advantages and disadvantages of each alternative were discussed, with the intention of generating discussion of the pros and cons of each choice.

4. "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs" was circulated to all clearinghouse directors, directors of ERIC search services, and other interested people. A cover letter requested comments and suggestions from the nearly 200 reviewers. Twenty-nine of the reviewers were also called by phone for their comments. Eighteen letters were received and seventeen telephone discussions were held. A personal visit was made to one clearinghouse and the issued discussed with the staff. (See Appendix B)

5. Sample abstracts were developed based on the draft guidelines for abstracting. (See Appendix C)

6. A summary was written of the responses to "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs." (See pages 49-52)

7. Based on these responses and the author's own analysis, the author presents six recommendations to DRG.

   A. Pubtype codes should be refined, pilot tested on actual documents, refined again, and then mandated for use.

   Three alternatives had been proposed for improving access to product, program and practice documents: a) revising the system of assigning descriptors; b) revising and expanding the use of Pubtype codes; c) establishing a separate system. The overwhelming choice of the respondents (those who reviewed and commented on the paper) was b, revising and expanding the use of Pubtype codes. Throughout the responses there was a stated preference for "fine tuning" the existing system--which most respondents felt was basically quite good--rather than undertaking any drastic changes. Most thought a separate system for practitioner-oriented documents was unnecessary and unwise, and that altering the system for assigning descriptors would cause more problems than it would solve.

Respondents agreed that the current Pubtype list was less than adequate, and suggested that it be refined through a process of pilot-testing cycles. Once refined and proved adequate for use with the actual documents with which ERIC is confronted, its use should be mandated. For a full discussion of this issue see pages 18-21 and 49-51.

B. Efforts should be made to reduce inter-clearinghouse inconsistency in indexing and abstracting.

Respondents were interested in improving inter-indexer consistency in the assignment of descriptors. Once again, it was felt that "fine tuning" in the use of descriptors was preferable to altering the system. Many felt that it would be helpful if the Thesaurus were supplemented with a dictionary containing full definitions of all terms, and requested an expansion in the number and detail of scope notes.

A number of respondents also suggested that an increase in the extent of the training provided to indexers and abstractors would be helpful. At present, some clearinghouses have extensive training programs in indexing and abstracting, and some have very little training. Some of the suggestions for improving consistency in training are: a) provide an annual training session in a central location for indexers from all clearinghouses; b) send a "road show" traveling from clearinghouse to clearinghouse to provide training; c) provide training packages to all clearinghouses.

One or two respondents also suggested the more radical approach of centralizing the indexing and abstracting function either by having indexing and abstracting done centrally rather than by separate clearinghouses or by having a central service which reviewed all clearinghouse abstracts for consistency.

C. The draft guidelines for abstracting product information documents should be refined and included in the ERIC processing manual.

The draft guidelines were well received by the respondents. Most thought they would be a helpful addition to the ERIC Processing Manual. (See guidelines, pages 23 to 32 and sample abstracts in Appendix C)

D. A term or terms for evaluated or validated materials should be agreed upon by the various clearinghouses and entered into the Thesaurus.

Terms suggested by the clearinghouse directors as valuable additions to the Thesaurus in this area were:

Evaluated Programs
Field Tested Programs
Field Testing
Program Evaluation
Demonstration Programs
Demonstration Projects
Pilot Projects
Exemplary Programs
Exemplary Products
Validated Programs

Many respondents thought it important that before any of these terms is entered into the system, agreement should be established among the clearinghouses concerning the precise meaning and use of each. (See pages 22, 23 and 51)

E. A mechanism should be established for the exchange of particularly successful computer search strategies for retrieving product, program and practice documents.

ERIC is becoming more and more a mediated system. That is, a skilled staff person receives a request for information from a user and translates that request into a strategy for searching the computerized data base. Individual searchers often save particularly successful search strategies and sometimes share these strategies with other professional search operators tied into the same computer system. Given the particular problems of conducting successful searches of product, program and practice documents, it may be worthwhile for ERIC to foster the exchange of canned searches among search service centers. This could be accomplished by any number of methods of communication from circulating a newsletter or memo to entering information about canned searches into the ERIC system itself.

F. Existing product and program information systems should be surveyed. Where feasible, ERIC should be coordinated with them.

A number of information systems which deal with curriculum materials were mentioned by respondents as meriting further investigation by ERIC personnel interested in the product-program-practice document problem. Among those mentioned were NIMIS, the Xerox Curriculum Center, and various state curriculum information retrieval systems.

To facilitate understanding of how the recommendations were developed, the author presents the balance of this report in three parts. First is the paper, "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs," with its appendixes, exactly as sent to the reviewers. Second is the summary of responses and comments from reviewers. Third is a series of appendixes containing such documentation as texts of letters received and a list of interviewees.

II. The ERIC System
and
Practitioner Needs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PURPOSE 10

PROCEDURES 10

FINDINGS 12

Need for Education Product, Program and Practice Documents 12

Retrieval of Documents on Education Products, Programs and Practices 14

Retrieval of Evaluated Materials 15

Abstracts 15

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES 16

Standardization of Descriptors 16

Use of Pubtype Codes 18

A Separate System for Instructional Materials 21

Retrieving Evaluated Products 22

ABSTRACTING DOCUMENTS CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS 23

Guidelines for Abstracting Documents Concerning Educational Product, Program and Practice Documents 28

APPENDIXES

1. 1. Questionnaire
   2. Definitions of Product, Program and Practice

2. Descriptors Used for Education Product, Program and Practice Documents

3. ERIC Publication/Document Types and Codes

PURPOSE

This brief paper is intended to generate discussion among those individuals most concerned with the ERIC system regarding ways in which ERIC could be expanded or adapated to better meet the needs of education practitioners. The desirability of increasing the orientation of ERIC to practitioners is widely accepted; it was explicitly suggested in three recent major studies of the ERIC system.[1] This paper outlines three possible approaches to making documents on educational products, programs and practices more easily accessible and presents sample guidelines for abstracting instructional materials. It is hoped that this preliminary exploration of possible alternatives will serve as a springboard for further discussion and developmental efforts.

PROCEDURES

Background information for this paper was gathered from three sources: 1) a questionnaire sent to Clearinghouse Directors in April 1975; 2) telephone interviews with a number of directors of

---

[1] Bernard M. Fry, Evaluation Study of ERIC Products and Services. Graduate Library School, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, March 1973.

P. W. Greenwood and D. M. Weiler, Alternative Models for the ERIC Clearinghouse Network. The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California, January 1972.

Cynthia C. Hull and Judith Wanger, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) File Partition Study. System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California, August 1972.

ERIC data base search services, and 3) a review of research reports, ERIC system documents, and related materials.

Questionnaire.

On April 11, 1975 a letter was sent to the director of each ERIC Clearinghouse. (For the text of the letter and definitions of terms, see Appendix 1.) The letter contained questions regarding current practice in the classification and abstracting of educational product, program and practice documents and asked for suggestions on how these procedures could be improved. Responses were obtained from all sixteen Clearinghouses.

Telephone Interviews.

Telephone interviews concerning ways in which the ERIC system could be improved in providing practitioner oriented materials and services were held with a variety of people including the following:

Gregory Benson, Education Program & Studies Information Services, Albany, New York

William Curtis, Xerox Curriculum Exchange, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Karen Dowling, Educational Materials Laboratory, Rockville, Maryland

Frank Mattas, San Mateo Education Resource Center, Redwood City, California

Harry Osgood, Area Cooperative Educational Services, North Haven, Connecticut

Carolyn Trohoski, Research and Information Services for Education, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania

Review of Documents.

A number of documents were reviewed to gather background information.

FINDINGS

Two basic problems were identified through the procedures described above:

First, ERIC has a disappointingly small collection of practitioner-oriented documents. Teachers, supervisors, administrators and curriculum developers seeking practical information to assist them in improving instruction require "how to" documents rather than theoretical papers. The ERIC system was not originally established to meet this need, and would require a considerable addition of documents concerning educational products, programs and practices to serve as a comprehensive resource for practitioners.

Second, those practitioner-oriented documents which are contained in ERIC are difficult to retrieve. There is no single descriptor, or small group of descriptors, which one can use to pull all product, program and practice documents on a given subject. Rather, there are literally hundreds of descriptors in the system used to designate instructional materials of various types and related practice-oriented documents.

These two problems, and related problems concerning evaluated materials and abstracts, are discussed in more detail below.

Need for Educational Product, Program and Practice Documents.

In 1972, Hull and Wanger surveyed a sample of 2,258 educators to ascertain the type of information that they most needed for their work. Curriculum materials for classroom use was consistently rated highest. Ninety percent of preschool/kindergarten teachers, 93% of elementary teachers, 90% of secondary teachers, 86% of adult basic education teachers, 82% of postsecondary teachers, 90% of reading specialists, 88% of vocational educators, 91% of special educators, 74% of librarians (who needed material for student services), 83% of principals and assistant principals, and 82% of consultants/supervisors/curriculum designers said they needed information on curriculum materials for classroom use--a higher percentage in each case than that indicated by each group for any other type of document for any other purpose. The only categories of educators who did not rate curriculum materials highest were superintendents/school board members; state agency staff; researchers; and counselors/psychologists.[2]

Informal discussions in the spring of 1975 with providers of ERIC data base search services confirmed these findings. One search director stated that teachers and supervisors usually want one of two types of information from ERIC: 1) practical ideas for instruction on a given topic, or 2) usuable instructional materials. These practitioners have a need for both documents on instructional practice that are contained within the ERIC collection and abstracts of copyrighted instructional materials available elsewhere.

---

[2] Hull and Wanger, op. cit., pp. IV-6 - IV-20.

Retrieval of Documents on Educational Products, Programs and Practices.

The ERIC system uses more than 500 descriptors to indicate educational product, program and practice documents. (A list of the descriptors mentioned by the Clearinghouse Directors as used by their staffs appears in Appendix 2.) Because the descriptor system is not hierarchical--that is, there is no broad term one can use which will include all the narrower terms--the user desiring only practice-oriented documents on a given subject is faced with two choices: 1) using several hundred descriptors to be sure of not omitting desired documents, or 2) not restricting the search by document type through the use of descriptors.

If the latter course is taken, the resulting list of documents often consists primarily of irrelevant citations. For example, a teacher seeking instructional materials for a third grade mathematics class might well be referred to documents concerning the theory of mathematics instruction, the history of mathematics curriculum development projects, and research studies comparing the ability of 8 and 10-year-olds to learn fractions, as well as to the instructional materials he or she was seeking.

A number of studies of the ERIC system have mentioned this problem and suggested approaches to solving it. Fry recommended coding documents by type.[3] Greenwood and Weiler suggested that classification of documents by type or intended audience would make the retrieval process much more efficient.[4] Hull and Wanger explored a number of possibilities for partitioning the ERIC file and particularly recommended partitions which would ease access to practical instructional information.[5]

---

[3] Fry, *op. cit.*

A system of Publication/Document Type Codes has now been developed, but it has serious flaws inhibiting its use to remedy the retrieval problem for education product, program and practice documents. (See discussion below.)

Retrieval of Evaluated Materials.

A subsidiary problem exists for practitioners seeking only instructional materials which have been field tested or evaluated. There are no descriptors in the system to designate such materials. The user must read through the abstracts of all the instructional materials elicited by a broader search to find those which have evaluation data.

Abstracts.

The abstracts of education product, program and practice documents may or may not contain the type of information the user most desires. The guidelines in the ERIC Processing Manual concerning the writing of abstracts of instructional materials are vague, leaving a great deal of discretion to the individual abstractor. The guidelines do not, for example, specifically discuss how to abstract a tested educational product. This leads inevitably to great variation from clearinghouse to clearinghouse in the writing and abstracts of instructional materials.

---

[4] Greenwood and Weiler, op. cit.

[5] Hull and Wanger, op. cit.

On the following pages three alternative strategies for retrieving documents on education products, programs and practices will be discussed. A separate section will deal with the special problem of retrieving evaluated materials, and guidelines will be proposed for abstracting educational product, program and practice documents.

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Whether or not the ERIC collection of instructional materials and related practitioner-oriented documents is greatly expanded, those materials currently in the system could be made more easily accessible. Three alternatives are discussed below: 1) the standardization of descriptors, 2) the revision and expanded use of Pubtype codes, and 3) establishment of a separate system for curriculum materials.

Standardization of Descriptors.

The ERIC Thesaurus currently contains hundreds of descriptors for educational product, program and practice documents. Appendix B contains a list of all the descriptors mentioned by clearinghouse directors queried concerning the descriptors used by their staffs for such documents. There was substantial variation among the clearinghouses in the descriptors chosen, but they fell primarily within the following five ERIC Group Display categories:

CURRICULUM
INSTRUCTION
TECHNIQUES
PROGRAMS
AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS AND METHODS[6]

Perhaps these five terms could be used as "standard" terms applied to all product, program or practice documents. That is, all such documents would be required to carry one (and, ideally, only one) of these five descriptors. For example, curriculum materials for a modern language course would have "Curriculum" as a descriptor as well as "Modern Language Curriculum."

Using this system, a practitioner could be sure of obtaining all curriculum materials in ERIC on a given subject by using the descriptor "Curriculum" in the search. The user could obtain all education product, program and practice documents in ERIC on a given subject by using all five "standard" terms together. And by restricting the search to only documents which had those descriptors, many irrelevant citations would be avoided.

The advantages of this strategy are the following: 1) it would use descriptors already in the Thesaurus; 2) it would employ an organizational scheme, the Group Displays, which already exists within the system; 3) it would be relatively simple to operate and to understand.

The drawbacks to this strategy are: 1) it would be only a partial solution to the problem. It still would not fully separate documents which are instructional materials from those which are about instructional materials; 2) it would require use of a hierarchical organization, which is contrary to present ERIC policy; 3) to be effective, it would require a revision of the descriptors applied to documents already in the ERIC collection.

---

[6] Descriptors used for education products appeared in all five categories, and programs and practices had descriptors which appeared in all the categories except AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS AND METHODS. (The complete lists of these Group Displays appear in Appendix B.)

Use of Pubtype Codes.

A system of Publication/Document Type (Pubtype) Codes has recently been developed for ERIC (see list of codes, Appendix 3). The basic idea behind these codes--that each document in the ERIC collection can be identified by publication type as well as by subject--lends itself nicely to the design of a strategy for easing the accessibility of product, program and practice documents. In theory, with each document assigned a Pubtype tag, instructional materials could be efficiently retrieved by using the descriptors to identify the subject matter and the Pubtype tag to restrict the search to the type of documents wanted. There are problems, however, with using the current coding system for this purpose. The categories are not appropriate.

For example, Pubtype B is used to identify "books, monographs, textbooks, programmed texts, etc. (not otherwise classifiable)." Even disregarding the "etc.", this grouping causes problems for the practitioner searching for instructional materials. Textbooks and programmed texts are instructional materials, while books and monographs usually are not. Thus, restricting a search to documents marked Pubtype B would yield some citations which are instructional materials but many which are not.

On the other hand, the distinction between Pubtype C ("curriculum guides; curriculum materials; teacher-developed materials; laboratory manuals") and Pubtype G ("guides; teaching guides; resource guides; study guides; administrative guides; leaders' guides; manuals; training manuals") seems difficult to fathom. Presumably the practitioner looking for teaching materials would use both of these Codes, plus B, A, K and perhaps O and Q.

The system, obviously, was designed to serve some other purpose for tracking document types and not for utilization by practitioners seeking instructional materials. An alternative system based on this idea, however, would address practitioners' needs.

To maximize ease of access to practitioner-oriented materials, a two-level coding system for publication/document type could be developed.

Level 1: a separate code for each document type.

A system of codes might be developed so that each type of document--from textbook to monograph to map--has its own distinct code. For example, a partial list might look like this:

Document	Code
textbook	10
....	..
programmed text	12
....	..
monograph	23
....	..
curriculum guide	30
....	..
laboratory manual	42
....	..

Using these codes, the user desiring only programmed texts or only curriculum guides could retrieve just those types of documents.

This system by itself, however, leaves two problems unsolved. First, the user who wished to retrieve all instructional materials on a given subject would have to use possibly 20 or 30 different pubtype codes to achieve a comprehensive listing, which is rather inconvenient. Second, the practitioner who desires to retrieve documents which describe educational programs and practices, but which are not themselves instructional materials, still has difficulties. To deal with these two problems, the system might contain a second level of coding.

Level 2: general categories.

Each document, in addition to being assigned a pubtype code as described above, might also be coded as a member of a larger category of document types. For example, a partial list might look like this:

Category	Code
instructional materials	X
documents describing instructional programs and practices, but not themselves instructional materials	Y
other	Z
....	..

Under this system a programmed text would be coded X12, while a monograph describing the use of programmed texts in classroom instruction would be coded Y23 (two-digit codes are from sample list on page 10).

The X (instructional materials) code would seem to be particularly useful. Documents are fairly readily identifiable as being instructional materials or not, and this would provide convenient access to instructional materials as a group. As a side benefit, researchers may find it quite useful to have the opposite search capability, that is, the ability to retrieve only those documents on a given subject which are not instructional materials.

The Y code, or code for documents about educational programs and practices, might be useful but raises certain difficulties. It might be difficult to define the boundaries of this category. Many research papers have implications for classroom instruction mentioned among their findings, for example, and theoretical essays sometimes contain some practical ideas for instruction. Whether or not there is a sufficiently large collection of distinct program and practice documents--and whether or not there is sufficient demand for searching just those documents, distinct from searching by subject matter--would seem to be a question which requires further research.

A Separate System for Instructional Materials.

A third possibility for easing access to instructional materials would be the establishment of a separate document system just for such materials. The problem here, of course, would be the extent to which this would cause duplication and waste. Since there appear to be ways of improving the present system through fine tuning, there may not be any need for seeking more dramatic alternatives. However, this is a possibility and is worthy of exploration.

Retrieving Evaluated Products.

Among the many instructional materials documents in the ERIC collection are some which contain data on their effectiveness as instruments of instruction. These data vary from results of simple field tests conducted by the developer to elaborate third-party evaluations.

At present there is no way to retrieve these documents as a group. There are no descriptors in ERIC for "field tested," "evaluated" or "validated." There is a demand, however, for the ability to retrieve such documents. Curriculum developers, researchers interested in product development, and teachers and curriculum supervisors concerned with demonstrated effectiveness of materials seek instructional materials documents which contain effectiveness data.

The problem of accessing these documents can be solved through any one of the three systems described above.

A. Descriptors

One way to provide access to these documents is to add a new descriptor or descriptors to the ERIC thesaurus. When queried concerning the need for new descriptors in this area, the clearinghouse directors responded that such descriptors were needed and suggested the following:

Evaluated Programs
Field Tested Programs
Field Testing
Program Evaluation
Demonstration Programs
Demonstration Projects
Pilot Projects
Exemplary Programs
Exemplary Products
Validated Programs

Perhaps just one descriptor indicating the presence of effectiveness data could be entered into the system and applied to all instructional materials documents containing such data.

B. Pubtype codes

If a system of pubtype codes designed specifically for improving access to instructional materials were instituted, then the presence or absence of effectiveness data could be indicated in the coding system. This could be done by providing separate detailed document-type codes to materials with such data or by developing a separate general category for such documents (for example, instructional materials without effectiveness data would be coded X, while those with effectiveness data were coded X').

C. Separate system

If a separate system were created to deal with instructional materials, the need for differentiating those with effectiveness data from those without would need to be one of the problems dealt with in the original design of the system.

ABSTRACTING DOCUMENTS CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

The following section will review the guidelines for abstracting instructional materials now in the ERIC Processing Manual, discuss suggestions for improving the abstracts given by ERIC Clearinghouse Directors, and present a draft of possible new guidelines.

The ERIC Processing Manual contains general guidelines on abstracting and brief suggestions specific to abstracting certain types of instructional materials. These guidelines leave a great deal of discretion to the individual abstractor confronted with an educational product or other types of classroom materials, resulting in wide variety and inconsistency in the abstracts of instructional materials entered into the ERIC system.

The basic information concerning abstracts of instructional materials given in the Manual is as follows:

Abstracts for instructional materials should be INDICATIVE; that is, they should concentrate on the scope and format of a document rather than on its content, and should be written from the viewpoint of an informed observer. This format is in contrast to that suggested for the INFORMATIVE abstract, recommended for research studies and theoretical papers, in which the abstractor is urged to concentrate on content and write as if he or she were the author presenting an objective summary of the paper.

Typical categories of information contained in an abstract, the Manual suggests, are subject matter, scope and purpose; publication/document type; the author's viewpoint or bias; intended audience; relationship to other works; intended use; special features; results or findings.

A limit of 200 words per abstract is given and, for INDICATIVE abstracts, the use of the passive voice and present tense are recommended.

The following specific guidelines are given for abstracting certain types of instructional materials:[7]

---

[7] ERIC Processing Manual, p. 206.

Curriculum Guides, Teacher Guides. These usually require INDICATIVE abstracts, which should contain: (1) subject area and grade level of the curricular material, (2) specific objectives of the course, (3) unit areas of the course, (4) particularly interesting methods used, and (5) supplementary activities and materials suggested.

Program Descriptions/Administrative Reports. These usually require INDICATIVE abstracts, which should contain: (1) objectives of the program and identification of the target population, (2) types of special teachers and other personnel and numbers of classes or students involved, (3) means or suggested means of carrying out the program, including any sort of community participation problems, and (5) to-date progress of the program with expected changes in future plans, or, if the program has been completed, conclusions or evaluations of the program's effectiveness.

Textbook/Instructional Materials. These usually require INDICATIVE abstracts, which should contain: (1) objectives of the text, including target student population, (2) description of the general nature of the subject matter, and (3) special methods used in meeting objectives, including notation of illustrations and accompanying activities. Recounting specific textual material is not necessary, unless doing so will explain methods used in achieving objectives. Tests or measurement/evaluation instruments, accompanying a report as supporting documentation, may be analyzed out as a separate accession. The TM Clearinghouse may be consulted if there are questions relating to such material.

ERIC Clearinghouse Directors were queried by letter regarding the desirability of refining the guidelines for abstracting instructional materials--specifically for educational products, programs and practices--to achieve more nearly standardized abstracts geared to the needs of practitioners. Most agreed that this would be a desirable goal. Their suggestions for the information which should be required to be included in an abstract fell into the following categories: subject, target audience, format, effectiveness, cost and other information. Listed below, following each topic heading, are the specific areas suggested for inclusion by the Clearinghouse Directors.

SUBJECT: major subject area / concept / orientation / objective / model or philosophy / why developed

TARGET AUDIENCE: grade level / age / proficiency level / scope of target audience

FORMAT: type of document / level of detail (how much has to be supplied by the teacher) / medium / options / to be used alone or with other materials

EFFECTIVENESS: outcomes / evaluation / internal or external evaluation / context in which tested / student assessment / benefits / availability of information on effectiveness / location of program and its duration

COST: installation cost / cost per student per year / needed equipment / needed staff training

OTHER: references to related documents / preview and review options / ordering information / names of distributor and developer

A teacher, administrator, or curriculum developer searching the ERIC system for information on instructional materials is most likely to be seeking either ideas for teaching methods or fully developed materials which can be purchased and used in the classroom. In either case, the practitioner has several decision criteria in mind. Some of those criteria are definitive or absolute: that is, unless they are met, the practitioner will reject the product. Other criteria are subsidiary or contributive. They are important in the practitioner's decision, but one of them by itself will determine that decision.

The goal of the abstract writer is to address the definitive criteria first and the subsidiary criteria second. That way, the practitioner's time is saved because abstracts for materials which do not meet the definitive criteria may be discarded after only a partial reading.

Obviously, there can be no foolproof set of rules for deciding what information should be in an abstract and in what order. One person's subsidiary criterion may be another person's definitive one, and to include all the potentially relevant information is impossible.[8]

The following draft guidelines for writing abstracts of educational products are based on the investigation and analysis described above and are intended to serve as a springboard for discussion and research.

---

[8] The question of what information is of most value in an abstract would seem to call for empirical investigation. Perhaps a sample of practitioners could be asked to rank order a list of topics, such as those listed above, in the order of their importance in an abstract.

Guidelines for Abstracting Documents Concerning Educational Product, Program and Practice Documents.

Education practitioners--teachers, supervisors, administrators--frequently seek information to assist them in classroom instruction. Two types of documents in the ERIC collection are particularly helpful to this group of users: documents which are actual instructional materials and documents which describe instructional programs and practices. Both types of documents appear in great variety. What they have in common is their practical "how to" orientation. Users seeking these documents want to know if the product or program described within will meet the specific instructional needs with which they are concerned. The abstract should help the user screen those documents which would be suitable from those which would not.

In writing such as abstract, the abstractor should try to answer, as effectively as possible within the 200 word limit, the questions a practitioner seeking materials for classroom use would be likely to ask. The following guidelines suggest seven such questions--concerning subject, target group, special attributes, format, costs, claims of effectiveness, and related materials--and note the types of information which could be included in the abstract in answer to each.

1. SUBJECT

Question: Are these materials relevant to the subject/content area I want to teach?

The first question to be answered regards content. Presumably, the descriptors used to search for the document provide a starting point, but the first sentence in the abstract should elaborate, defining the range and depth of content coverage. If not indicated in the document title, the product or program name should appear. For example:

> This text surveys American history from 1700 to 1900 with emphasis on political developments and social customs.

> The Plymouth Career Education Workbooks focus heavily on tasks associated with specific jobs, primarily jobs in the manufacturing and service sectors.

2. TARGET AUDIENCE

Question: Are these materials suitable for the intended learners?

The abstract should state the age, grade or proficiency level of learners for whom the materials are designed, and any additional special characteristics (e.g., bi-lingual, gifted, rural). For example:

> The games described are for children ages 8-12 with normal physical skills and some experience with basic gymnastics.

> The basic lessons are designed for third grade students reading at or slightly above grade level. Supplementary materials are included for more advanced students.

3. SPECIAL ATTRIBUTES

Question: What is special about these materials?

What might the user find particularly interesting about the materials? Among the possibilities:

- the instructional principles or rationale upon which the materials are based

> The lessons are based on the belief that the student can best learn about differences in musical style by attempting his or her own composition in each style studied.

- the role of the instructor

The teacher does not visibly direct the course of the experiment, but serves as a facilitator.

- the role of the learner

The students are expected to actively participate in the selection of the scripts to be enacted.

- methods or techniques

Value problems are explored through role playing techniques.

- goals or purposes

The goal of these materials is to reduce sex stereotyping of occupations.

- parent or public involvement

A key element of the program is the involvement of local representatives of business and industry.

4. FORMAT

Question: What form are these materials in?

Is it a book? A set of mimeograph masters? A programmed text? A multimedia kit? In addition to type of document, other information about format the user may want to know might include:

- can the materials be used alone or should they be supplemented?
- must the lessons be used in the order given, or can one pick and choose?
- are there a variety of options for use described?
- do the materials contain assessment instruments?

For example: The package consists of five filmstrips with discussion guides. They are intended to be used in order, and to supplement a standard driver training program. A 20-question multiple choice quiz for assessing student mastery is included.

The self-contained science kits contain all the materials necessary for the experiments. They may be used individually or as a series.

5. COSTS AND PREREQUISITES

Question: Can I afford this?

The user will want to know all of the associated costs of a product or program. If the following types of information are available, they should be noted:

- cost of expendable materials
- cost of reusable materials
- special equipment needed
- special facilities needed
- required staff training
- outside or specialized personnel required
- organizational requirements (e.g., scheduling)
- special services (e.g., transportation)
- time requirements

For example: The program is designed for 15 two-hour periods of instruction and requires a centrifuge. The reusable guide books are $6 per copy. The expendable worksheets cost $3 per student.

The program requires that participating students spend all day two days a week for a semester working at a job in the food services field.

6. EFFECTIVENESS

Question: Are these materials effective?

If the materials contain claims of effectiveness, or claims of other positive attributes, which are backed up with data, this should be noted in the abstract. The abstract should indicate the type of data which is offered to support the claims. On whom were the materials tested? In what ways was their achievement measured? Was the evaluation done by the developer or by an outside party? For example:

The developer field tested the materials with 100 fifth grade students in three suburban schools. She presents evidence that the students in the LIGHT program achieved significantly higher scores on the Word Meaning and Paragraph Meaning sections of the Standford Achievement Tests than did a control group.

Other types of claims which may be noteworthy include:

- social fairness

The author claims that illustrations and text references have been screened for both sex and race bias and found to represent both sexes and minority races in equitable proportion.

- replicability or transportability

The program was implemented successfully in five different school districts without the assistance of the developer.

- careful product development

The materials were refined through four cycles of field testing, with center city children, and revision.

7. RELATED MATERIALS

Question: Is this work part of a series?

Curriculum materials oftentimes come in series. If this is true of the document being abstracted, that feature should be noted and references given to the other documents in the series. For example:

Other units developed as part of this project are "Solar Energy and You" (ED 000 000), and "Hydroelectric Power and You" (ED 000 000).

APPENDIX 1

1. Questionnaire
2. Definitions of Product, Program and Practice

April 11. 1975

Dear ERIC Clearinghouse Director:

The ERIC system was originally established to deal with information concerning education research. Increasingly. however, the system is also being asked to serve the needs of education practitioners for information concerning instructional products, programs and practices*. I am currently working under contract with the Division of School Practice and Service of the National Institute of Education to gather suggestions for ways in which the ERIC system might improve ease of access to product and program information.

I would appreciate any and all suggestions that you and your staff might have concerning possible improvements along these lines in the information retrieval system. Drafts of suggested revisions in or additions to the system will be circulated to you for comment. The following types of information from your staff would be particularly helpful to us in drafting recommendations:

1. DESCRIPTORS
   a)What descriptors do you use to designate instructional products?
   b)What descriptors do use use to designate instructional programs and practices?
   c)What additional descriptors, if any, would help system users retrieve product information? Program and practice information?
   d) What additional descriptors, if any, would help system users retrieve information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field testing or evaluation data are available?

2. ABSTRACTS
   a)What guidelines do you follow in writing abstracts of instructional products? Of programs and practices? (Please send samples, if possible.)
   b)In what ways could the abstracts be improved to help a practitioner decide which products, programs and practices to pursue further?
   c)What additional information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field test or evaluation data are available, should be included in the abstract?

3. SUBSYSTEMS
   a)Do you use any subsystems or supplementary systems to classify product, program or practice information? If so, please describe.

---

* For definition of product,program and practice please see attachment.

b)What, if any, subsystems or supplementary systems do you think would be helpful to practitioners interested in product, program and practice information?

Any additional ideas or suggestions you may have would be deeply appreciated. Please send all replies to me at the following address: 6723 Towne Lane Road, McLean, Virginia 22101. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

JoAnn M Steiger

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions have been adopted:

A product is a tangible item or group of items of instructional material which is basically self-contained and transportable. A multi-media package on career opportunities in electronics would be a product.

A program is a systematic set of procedures for instruction or administration consisting of a number of components but forming a cohesive whole. A program may or may not have accompanying instructional materials. For our purposes, a program is considered to be a system that cannot be replicated without assistance. (A program which is packaged so as to be self-contained and transportable can be considered a product.) A detailed plan for ungrading classrooms would be a program.

A practice is a discrete element of instructional method or administrative procedure. Using maps to teach mathematics would be a practice.

APPENDIX 2

Descriptors Used for Education Product, Program and Practice Documents

The following pages contain the group displays from the ERIC Thesaurus for the terms CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, TECHNIQUES, PROGRAMS and AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS AND METHODS. Descriptors marked with a check were mentioned by clearinghouse directors as being used to describe educational products, Descriptor marked with an x were mentioned as being used to describe educational programs and practices.

Following the group displays is a list of the descriptors which were mentioned by the clearinghouse directors but which are not members of one of these five group displays.

050 Audiovisual Materials and Methods

- AIRBORNE TELEVISION
- ANIMATION
- ✓ AUDIOVISUAL AIDS
- AUDIOVISUAL COMMUNICATION
- ✓ AUDIOVISUAL PROGRAMS
- ✓ AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL AIDS
- BROADCAST TELEVISION
- CARTOONS
- CHARTS
- ✓ CLASSROOM MATERIALS
- CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION
- COLOR PRESENTATION
- COLOR TELEVISION
- COMMERCIAL TELEVISION
- COMPUTER OUTPUT MICROFILM
- DIAGRAMS
- DIAL ACCESS INFORMATION SYSTEMS
- DISPLAY SYSTEMS
- ✓ DOCUMENTARIES
- DUBBING
- EDITORIALS
- EDUCATIONAL RADIO
- ✓ EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION
- ELECTROMECHANICAL AIDS
- EXHIBITS
- EXPOSITIONS
- FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
- FILM LIBRARIES
- FILM PRODUCTION
- FILM STUDY
- ✓ FILMS
- ✓ FILMSTRIPS
- FIXED SERVICE TELEVISION
- ✓ FLES MATERIALS
- ✓ FOREIGN LANGUAGE FILMS
- GRAPHS
- ✓ HANDWRITING MATERIALS
- HEALTH ACTIVITIES HANDBOOKS
- HEALTH BOOKS
- ✓ HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCABULARY BOOKS
- ✓ HISTORY TEXTBOOKS
- HOLOGRAPHY
- HORIZONTAL TEXTS
- ✓ ILLUSTRATIONS
- ✓ INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS
- ✓ INSTRUCTIONAL FILMS
- ✓ INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
- ✓ INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA
- INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION
- INSTRUCTOR CENTERED TELEVISION
- KINESCOPE RECORDINGS
- ✓ LABORATORY MANUALS
- ✓ LANGUAGE AIDS
- LANGUAGE RECORDS (PHONOGRAPH)
- ✓ LARGE TYPE MATERIALS
- MANIPULATIVE MATERIALS
- ✓ MAPS
- ✓ MASS MEDIA
- MASTER TAPES (AUDIO)
- MATHEMATICS MATERIALS
- MECHANICAL TEACHING AIDS
- ✓ MEDIA SELECTION
- MICROFICHE
- MICROFILM
- MICROFORM READER PRINTERS
- MICROFORM READERS
- MICROFORMS
- MICROREPRODUCTION
- MULTICHANNEL PROGRAMING
- ✓ MULTICULTURAL TEXTBOOKS
- OPEN CIRCUIT TELEVISION
- ✓ ORIENTATION MATERIALS
- OVERHEAD TELEVISION
- ✓ PHONOGRAPH RECORDS
- ✓ PHONOTAPE RECORDINGS
- PHOTOGRAPHS
- PICTORIAL STIMULI
- ✓ PROGRAMED MATERIALS
- ✓ PROGRAMED TEXTS
- PROGRAMING (BROADCAST)
- ✓ PROTOCOL MATERIALS
- PUBLIC TELEVISION
- RADIO
- RAISED LINE DRAWINGS
- REALIA
- ✓ SINGLE CONCEPT FILMS
- SLIDES
- SOUND EFFECTS
- ✓ SOUND FILMS
- SOUND TRACKS
- SPECIAL EFFECTS
- ✓ STUDENT DEVELOPED MATERIALS
- STUDENT WRITING MODELS
- ✓ SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTBOOKS
- ✓ TALKING BOOKS
- ✓ TAPE RECORDINGS
- ✓ TEACHER DEVELOPED MATERIALS
- ✓ TEACHING MACHINES
- TELEGRAPHIC MATERIALS
- TELEVISION
- TELEVISION COMMERCIALS
- TELEVISION VIEWING
- ✓ TEXTBOOKS
- ✓ THREE DIMENSIONAL AIDS
- ✓ TOYS
- TRANSPARENCIES
- VERTICAL TEXTS
- ✓ VIDEO CASSETTE SYSTEMS
- ✓ VIDEO TAPE RECORDINGS
- ✓ VISUAL AIDS

ACCELERATED COURSES
✓ACTIVITY UNITS
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES
AMERICAN GOVERNMENT (COURSE)
ARITHMETIC CURRICULUM
BOOKKEEPING
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
BUSINESS ENGLISH
BUSINESS SUBJECTS
COLLEGE CURRICULUM
COLLEGE SCIENCE
CONSUMER EDUCATION
CONSUMER SCIENCE
CONVERSATIONAL LANGUAGE COURSES
CORE COURSES
CORE CURRICULUM
CORRESPONDENCE COURSES
X COURSE CONTENT
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS
COURSE OBJECTIVES
COURSES
CREDIT COURSES
CURRICULUM
CURRICULUM DESIGN
CURRICULUM ENRICHMENT
X ✓CURRICULUM GUIDES
CURRICULUM PROBLEMS
EDUCATION COURSES
ELECTIVE SUBJECTS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SCIENCE
ELEMENTARY SCIENCE
ENGLISH CURRICULUM
✓X ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS
ETHNIC STUDIES
✓EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM
FELLOWSHIPS
FLES
FLIGHT TRAINING
FUSED CURRICULUM
GENERAL SCIENCE
HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM
HOME ECONOMICS
HONORS CURRICULUM
HUMAN RELATIONS UNITS
✓INDIVIDUALIZED CURRICULUM
INSERVICE COURSES
INSTITUTE TYPE COURSES
INTEGRATED CURRICULUM
INTELLECTUAL DISCIPLINES
INTENSIVE LANGUAGE COURSES
LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY
✓LANGUAGE PROGRAMS
LIBERAL ARTS
MARKETING
MATHEMATICS CURRICULUM
MERCHANDISING
MILITARY SCIENCE
MILITARY TRAINING
✓MODERN LANGUAGE CURRICULUM
MODERN SCIENCE
NATURAL SCIENCES
NONCREDIT COURSES
OFFICE PRACTICE
PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY
PHYSICS CURRICULUM
PRESCHOOL CURRICULUM
PRETECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS
X PROGRAM CONTENT
X PROGRAM LENGTH
✓PROGRAMED UNITS
PUBLIC SPEAKING
RADIO TECHNOLOGY
REMEDIAL COURSES
SALESMANSHIP
SCIENCE COURSE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
SCIENCE COURSES
SCIENCE CURRICULUM
✓SCIENCE PROGRAMS
SCIENCE UNITS
SCIENCES
SECONDARY SCHOOL SCIENCE
SHOP CURRICULUM
X SHORT COURSES
SOCIAL STUDIES
✓SOCIAL STUDIES UNITS
SPEECH CURRICULUM
SPIRAL CURRICULUM
X ✓STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES
X STUDENT CENTERED CURRICULUM
STUDY ABROAD
✓STUDY GUIDES
SUMMER SCIENCE PROGRAMS
TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM
X ✓TEACHING GUIDES
TECHNOLOGY
TELEVISION CURRICULUM
TEXTBOOK CONTENT
UNGRADED CURRICULUM
UNIT PLAN
✓UNITS OF STUDY (SUBJECT FIELDS)
URBAN STUDIES
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
WOMENS STUDIES

270 Instruction

ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT
ACCELERATED PROGRAMS
AIRBORNE FIELD TRIPS
APPRENTICESHIPS
ARTICULATION (PROGRAM)
ASSIGNMENTS
ATTENDANT TRAINING
AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION
AUDITORY TRAINING
AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
BIOLOGY INSTRUCTION
BRANCHING
CHAUTAUQUAS
CHEMISTRY INSTRUCTION
CLASS MANAGEMENT
CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION
CLOTHING INSTRUCTION
COLLEGE INSTRUCTION
COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION
COMPUTER ORIENTED PROGRAMS
CONTINUOUS PROGRESS PLAN
CONVENTIONAL INSTRUCTION
COOKING INSTRUCTION
CORRESPONDENCE STUDY
COUNSELOR TRAINING

CROSS AGE TEACHING
CROSS CULTURAL TRAINING
CUSTODIAN TRAINING
DEDUCTIVE METHODS
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS
DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS
DIAGNOSTIC TEACHING
DISCUSSION PROGRAMS
DRAMA WORKSHOPS
DROPOUT TEACHING
EDUCATIONAL GAMES
EFFECTIVE TEACHING
ENGLISH INSTRUCTION
EPISODE TEACHING
ETHICAL INSTRUCTION
EXPERIMENTAL TEACHING
FIELD INSTRUCTION
FOODS INSTRUCTION
GEOGRAPHY INSTRUCTION
GOAL ORIENTATION
GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD
GROUP INSTRUCTION
HANDWRITING INSTRUCTION
HISTORY INSTRUCTION
HOME INSTRUCTION
HOME STUDY
HOME VISITS
HOMEWORK
HUMANITIES INSTRUCTION
INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION
INDUSTRIAL TRAINING
INQUIRY TRAINING
INSERVICE TEACHING
INSTRUCTION
INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN
INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT
INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY
JOB TRAINING
LABORATORY TRAINING
LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE APPROACH
LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION
LARGE GROUP INSTRUCTION
LAW INSTRUCTION
LEADERSHIP TRAINING
LIBRARY INSTRUCTION
LITERATURE PROGRAMS
MANAGEMENT GAMES
MASS INSTRUCTION
MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION
METHODS COURSES
MICROTEACHING
MULTIMEDIA INSTRUCTION

NUTRITION INSTRUCTION
OFF THE JOB TRAINING
ON THE JOB TRAINING
ORIENTATION
PACING
PARENT WORKSHOPS
PART TIME TEACHING
PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT
PATTERN DRILLS (LANGUAGE)
PEDIATRICS TRAINING
PEER TEACHING
PHYSICS INSTRUCTION
PRACTICUMS
PRESCHOOL WORKSHOPS
PROFESSIONAL TRAINING
PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION
PROGRAMED TUTORING
PROJECT TRAINING METHODS
PROMPTING

READING INSTRUCTION
REFRESHER COURSES
REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION
REMEDIAL PROGRAMS
REMEDIAL READING
RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTION UNITS
RETRAINING
SCHOOL ORIENTATION
SCIENCE INSTRUCTION
SCIENCE PROJECTS
SENSITIVITY TRAINING
SENSORY TRAINING
SENTENCE DIAGRAMING
SEWING INSTRUCTION
SHELTERED WORKSHOPS
SPEECH INSTRUCTION
SPELLING INSTRUCTION
STAFF ORIENTATION
STUDENT IMPROVEMENT
STUDENT PARTICIPATION
STUDENT PROJECTS
SUBSTITUTION DRILLS
SUMMER WORKSHOPS
SUPERVISED FARM PRACTICE
SUPERVISORY TRAINING
TEACHER ORIENTATION
TEACHER PARTICIPATION
TEACHER SEMINARS
TEACHER WORKSHOPS
TEACHING
TEACHING MODELS
TEACHING PROCEDURES
TEAM TRAINING
TELECOURSES
TELEPHONE INSTRUCTION
TELEVISED INSTRUCTION
TEXTBOOK ASSIGNMENTS
TEXTILES INSTRUCTION
TRAINING
TRAINING OBJECTIVES
TRAVEL TRAINING
TUTORIAL PROGRAMS
URBAN TEACHING
VOCATIONAL RETRAINING
VOLUNTEER TRAINING
WORKBOOKS
WORKSHEETS
WORKSHOPS

410 Programs

ACTIVITIES
✓ X ADULT PROGRAMS
ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAMS
✓ ADVANCED PROGRAMS
✓ X AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS
ASSEMBLY PROGRAMS
CLASSROOM GUIDANCE PROGRAMS
✓ COLLEGE PROGRAMS
COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS
✓ COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS
COUNSELING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
COUNTY PROGRAMS
DAY PROGRAMS
DAYTIME PROGRAMS
DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
EVENING PROGRAMS
FAMILY PROGRAMS
FEEDER PROGRAMS
X FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS
FOUNDATION PROGRAMS
✓ HOME PROGRAMS
✓ IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

✓ INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAMS
INPLANT PROGRAMS
X INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS)
INSURANCE PROGRAMS
INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS
X INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS
INTERSTATE PROGRAMS
✓ PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS
X PROGRAMS
PROJECTS
REGIONAL PROGRAMS
RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS
SCIENCE FAIRS
✓ SCIENCE INSTITUTES
SELF HELP PROGRAMS
X SPECIAL DEGREE PROGRAMS
SPECIAL PROGRAMS
STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS
✓ SUMMER INSTITUTES
✓ SUMMER PROGRAMS
TEACHER EXCHANGE PROGRAMS
TEACHER PROGRAMS
✓ X TEACHING PROGRAMS
TECHNICAL INSTITUTES
TRANSFER PROGRAMS
VACATION PROGRAMS
WASTE DISPOSAL
WEEKEND PROGRAMS
✓ X WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS
✓ WORK STUDY PROGRAMS
YOUTH PROGRAMS

510 Techniques

AFTER SCHOOL TUTORING
AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION
✓AUDIOLINGUAL METHODS
✓XAUTOINSTRUCTIONAL METHODS
AUTOMATION
✓CENTERS OF INTEREST
✓CLASSROOM GAMES
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TECHNIQUES
✓XCLASSROOM TECHNIQUES
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS
COMPUTER GRAPHICS
XCONCEPT TEACHING
CONFERENCES
✓XCOOPERATIVE TEACHING
CREATIVE ACTIVITIES
CREATIVE READING
XCREATIVE TEACHING
CULTURING TECHNIQUES
✓XDEMONSTRATIONS (EDUCATIONAL)
XDISCUSSION (TEACHING TECHNIQUE)
DROPOUT PREVENTION
✓XEDUCATIONAL METHODS
ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAPHY
ENRICHMENT
ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES
EXPERIMENTS
FARM VISITS
✓FIELD TRIPS
FLEXIBLE PROGRESSION
GAME THEORY
GRADE REPETITION
GROUPING PROCEDURES
INDEPENDENT STUDY
INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES
INDIVIDUAL STUDY
XINDUCTIVE METHODS
✓INSTRUCTIONAL TRIPS
INTELLECTUALIZATION
INTERACTION PROCESS ANALYSIS
✓INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH
INTERMODE DIFFERENCES
INTERVAL PACING
KINESTHETIC METHODS
LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS
LABORATORY PROCEDURES
LABORATORY TECHNIQUES
XLEAD LECTURE PLAN
LEADERSHIP STYLES
LECTURE
LESSON PLANS
MAGNIFICATION METHODS
MANUFACTURING
MASS PRODUCTION
MEETINGS
METHODOLOGY
METHODS
✓MODELS
MOTIVATION TECHNIQUES
MUSIC TECHNIQUES
NUMERICAL CONTROL
OPTIONAL BRANCHING
PARENT CONFERENCES
PARENT PARTICIPATION
PARENT TEACHER CONFERENCES
PARENT TEACHER COOPERATION
PARTICIPATION
PHONICS
PHYSICS EXPERIMENTS
POLICE SEMINARS
PRESERVATION
PREVENTION
PRODUCTION TECHNIQUES
PUBLICIZE
QUESTIONNAIRES
READING GAMES
REDUNDANCY
REPETITIVE FILM SHOWINGS
REPROGRAPHY
SCIENCE EXPERIMENTS
SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY
XSEMINARS
SEQUENTIAL APPROACH
SIGHT METHOD
✓SIMULATION
XSMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION
STUDENT PROMOTION
STUDENT SEMINARS
STUDY
SYMPOSIA
✓XTEACHING METHODS
XTEACHING STYLES
✓XTEACHING TECHNIQUES
✓XTEAM TEACHING
TECHNIQUES
✓XTHEMATIC [illegible]
✓XTRAINING [illegible]
TUTORING
WRITING EXERCISES

Additional Descriptors Reported

020 Administration

Administrator Guides
Leaders Guides
Program Guides
Program Coordination
Program Descriptions
Program Design
Program Improvement
Program Planning
Program Administration

030 Arts

Art Materials

080 Communication

Sequential Programs
Computer Programs

040 Attitudes

Educational Accountability

090 Counseling

Guidance Programs

100 Culture

Intercultural Programs

130 Development

Program Development
Educational Development

140 Education

Adult Education Programs
Compensatory Education programs
Educational Programs
Inservice Teacher Education
Educational Strategies
Cooperative Education

170 Equipment

Magnetic Tape Cassettes

180 Evaluation

Program Evaluation

190 Evaluation Techniques

Precision Teaching
Questioning Techniques

210 Facilities

Instructional Materials Center

220 Finance

Performance Contracts

230 Government

Federal Programs
State Programs

250 Health and Safety

Health Guides
Health Programs

290 Language and Speech

College Language Programs
Language Guides
FLES Programs
Language Laboratory Use

310 Learning and Cognition

Activity Learning
Problem Solving

320 Library Materials

Books
Bulletins
Guides
Manuals
Literature Guides

390 Physical Education & Recreation

Cocurricular Activities
Games

420 Psychology

Role Playing
Sociodrama

Additional Descriptors Reported (Continued)

440 Reading

Reading Materials
Supplementary Reading Materials

460 Resources

Educational Resources
Resource Guides
Resource Materials
Science Materials

490 Sociology

Action Programs (Community)

500 Standards

Evaluation Criteria

APPENDIX 3

ERIC

Publication/Document Types and Codes

A	Audio Visual/Nonprint Media; Audiovisual Aids; Films; Tape Recordings; Phonotape Recordings; Computer Programs; etc.
B	Books; Monographs; Textbooks; Programmed Texts; etc. (not otherwise classifiable)
C	Curriculum Guides; Curriculum Materials; Teacher-Developed Materials; Laboratory Manuals
D	Directories; Membership Lists; Table of Organization; Reference Works Dealing with Organizations/Institutions; etc.
G	Guides; Teaching Guides; Resource Guides; Study Guides; Administrative Guides; Leaders Guides; Manuals; Training Manuals
H	Legislation, Legislative Hearings, Legislative Reports, Congressional Documents. (Include both Federal and State levels; include National Commissions). Court Cases and Decisions (all levels).
J	Journal Articles; Serials; Periodicals; Bulletins; Newsletters; Newspapers; etc.
K	Program/Project Descriptions; Implementation Efforts
L	Bibliographies; Annotated Bibliographies; Book Catalogs; Abstracts; Literature Reviews; Literature Searches/Guides; Book Lists; Book Reviews; Library Guides; Indexes (Locators); State-of-the-Art Reviews
M	Maps; Atlases; Gazetteers
N	Numerical and Statistical Tables; Quantitative Data and Analyses
O	Other
P	Proceedings; Conference Records/Minutes (entire)
Q	Questionnaires; Tests; Measurement Devices; Evaluation Devices
R	Research Reports; Technical Reports; Studies
S	Speeches; Conference Reports; "Papers presented at...", Verbal Presentations; etc., (not otherwise classifiable)
T	Theses; Dissertations
V	Dictionaries; Vocabularies; Glossaries; Thesauri
Y	Annual Reports; Yearbooks

FIGURE 5-6
PUBLICATION/DOCUMENT TYPES AND CODES

III. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS

The paper "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs" was mailed to nearly 200 people with a cover letter requesting comments. Those sent the paper include all clearinghouse directors, directors of ERIC search services and other interested people. Twenty-nine of the reviewers were also called by phone. Of these, phone discussions were actually held with seventeen. Letters were received from fifteen. For a list of those interviewed and the text of letters received, see Appendix B.

The respondents varied widely in their areas of concern. Two themes which recurred in a large percentage of the responses were the desirability of "fine tuning" the existing system to meet practitioner needs better (rather than attempting any wholesale revisions) and the need to increase inter-clearinghouse consistency in indexing and abstracting.

A number of respondents stated a need for policy clarification. That instructional materials have gradually been introduced into the system without any officially promulgated decision to do so was seen as part of the problem. Some felt that ERIC Central should issue a policy clarification on this and related matters, particularly the treatment of Level III materials.

Only two respondents thought a separate system for instructional materials was the best route. Most thought that refinement of the Pubtype codes the simplest solution. It was suggested that the Pubtypes be refined; expanded to include, among other things, a special category for evaluated materials; pilot tested on ERIC system documents; further revised; and then mandated. The three respondents who did not prefer this approach argued for keeping ERIC in natural language only. These three were unhappy with any action that might make the system less accessible to the person doing a hand search, and objected to increasing dependence of searchers on intermediaries.

Most respondents felt that any major revisions of the descriptor system would cause more problems than they would solve. One pointed out that the problem of inconsistency in the assignment of descriptors was system-wide and not restricted to practitioner-oriented materials. Most felt that improving the consistency of assignment of descriptors would be a more productive approach than revising the Thesaurus.

Among the suggestions for improving consistency in the use of descriptors were to expand the number and detail of scope notes, develop a dictionary with full definitions of all terms, train indexers more intensively, increase centralization of the indexing process, and require central editing of clearinghouse work. Increased training and greater centralization were also suggested for improving the abstracting process.

The draft guidelines for abstracting product information documents were well received. When questioned, most respondents stated that such guidelines would be helpful. Some feared that the 200-word limit would preclude addressing all the topics in the guidelines, but liked the "questions" approach.

A number of clearinghouses explained their individual approaches to solving some of the problems described in the paper. Both the

Clearinghouse on Science, Mathematics and Environmental Education and the Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children described their internal use of highly refined Pubtype codes. The Clearinghouse on Science, Mathematics and Environmental Education and the Clearinghouse on Social Studies/Social Science Education pointed out the demand for, and described their production of, publications specifically aimed at practitioners. A clearinghouse document, The Directory of Projects and Programs in Environmental Education for Elementary and Secondary Schools (by John F. Disinger and Beverly Lee; 1973), was cited as an example of the kinds of documents practitioners seem to find useful. It was suggested that the clearinghouses devote more resources to the development and dissemination of such publications.

Although there was general sympathy with the desire to index and describe evaluated materials, respondents pointed out some problems in this area. First was the relative lack of such information. One respondent feared that undue emphasis on evaluations would tend to cast well-funded curriculum projects, which could afford fancy evaluations, in an unfairly favorable light while penalizing materials developed with more modest funding. Second, a number of respondents were wary of the wide variety of the meanings of "validation" and "evaluation" in the field, stating that very careful criteria would have to be developed for the use of such terms. However, there was general agreement that a term like "validated materials" should be added to the Thesaurus and to the Pubtype codes.

Other comments included the following:

- The needs of administrators for "how to" documents on school management issues should not be overlooked.
- ERIC might benefit from more interchange of field personnel with individuals operating other information systems.
- The circulation of a newsletter might help increase communication among clearinghouses.
- When changes are made in the system that cannot be made retrospectively, "pointer documents" should be added to the system giving the searcher directions for finding documents classified under the previous system.

A number of respondents also recommended that ERIC directors make a formal effort to keep in touch with directors of curriculum and other information systems within and outside the field of education. Education systems specifically mentioned include NIMIS, Xerox Curriculum Center, and EPIE. Groups outside of education with which it was recommended contact should be maintained were the National Library of Medicine and the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services.

APPENDIX A

1. Letter to Clearinghouse Directors, April 11, 1975
2. Responses from Clearinghouse Directors

APPENDIX B

1. Written Comments Received on "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs"

2. List of Persons with whom Interviews Were Held

List of Individuals Interviewed by Telephone

Gregory Benson
Educational Program and Studies Information Services
New York Education Department
Albany, New York

Barbara Booth
Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Marcia Boyer
Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Everett Edington
Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Erwin Flaxman
Clearinghouse on Urban Education
New York, New York

Richard Herlig
Project Communicate
Kansas State Department of Education
Topeka, Kansas

Paul Hood
Far West Regional Laboratory
San Francisco, California

Eleanor Horne
Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation
Princeton, New Jersey

Robert Howe
Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics and Environmental Education
Columbus, Ohio

Kathleen McLane
Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
Arlington, Virginia

Charles Missar
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C.

Harry Osgood
Area Cooperative Educational Services
Educational Resources Center
New Haven, Connecticut

Paul Perry
Harvard University Graduate School of Education
Monroe C. Gutman Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Irene Smith
Education Information Center
Rhode Island Department of Education
Providence, Rhode Island

Mima Spencer
Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education
Urbana, Illinois

Roy Tally
Wisconsin Information Retrieval for Education
Madison, Wisconsin

Judith Yarborough
Clearinghouse on Information Resources
Stanford, Claifornia

A personal visit was made to the Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children in Reston, Virginia. Discussions were held with Joyce Aegerter, June Jordan, Dorothy Bloch and Marion Cambell of the Clearinghouse staff.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE ABSTRACTS BASED ON DRAFT GUIDELINES

The following two abstracts are samples of abstracts written in accordance with the guidelines presented on pages 28 to 32.

1. DeVries, David; Edwards, Keith

Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) Instructional Process Curriculum Units: Teachers' Manual, Student Materials

1975

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland Center for Social Organization of Schools

National Institute of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

The teachers' manual and student materials present an instructional strategy applicable to all subject areas requiring rote learning and drill. The core of the program is the teachers' manual explaining how to adapt the method to a wide variety of subjects in grades 3-12. In addition, the prepared units of student materials can be purchased for certain subjects and grades--language arts (grades 3-4, 6-9), math (5-7, 11), science (7-8) and industrial arts (11-12). Students are divided into groups of 4-5 members of varying ability. The members of these groups compete individually in an instructional game against members of equal ability from other groups. In the competition, the members score points for their team. Cost depends on whether teachers wish to prepare their own materials. The basic cost is $3.00 for the manual. A reusable sample kit including manual, sample games, worksheets, scoresheets, table markets, etc., costs $25. The games are intended as a supplement to traditional teaching methods. The developers present evidence that in eight out of nine classroom evaluations, in a variety of subjects, TGT produced significant positive effects on student academic achievement when compared to a control group. TGT also reportedly increased positive student attitudes toward the classroom and increased peer tutoring and mutual concern.

2. Beck, Isabel L.

The New Primary Grades Reading System (NRS)

1975

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Learning Research and Development Center

National Institute of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

This describes an individualized system for teaching the reading skills usually included in the first three years of reading instruction. NRS uses a code-breaking approach to beginning reading. A mixture of synthetic and analytic phonics is employed, along with text displays that illustrate linguistic principles. NRS also seeks to build a recognition vocabulary. Comprehension skills are taught parallel with decoding. The system was conceived for use in urban schools, especially among lower income groups. The authors provide evidence that it has been effective not only with these populations, but also with suburban and other pupils. The program is composed of 14 levels, each containing approximately 10 lessons. A prescriptive portion (blending booklets, workbooks, cassette tapes, group readers) is intended to teach new skills. A choice portion (read-alone stories, games, manipulables) provides activities to maintain skills and build fluency. Levels I and II are led by the teacher with a small group of students. In Level III new instruction is presented to each student individually on cassette. The program requires 4-6 cassette players with cue stops and head sets per classroom. Teacher training is required before use of the program.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ERIC CLEARING HOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

April 18, 1975

Dr. JoAnne Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger;

This Clearinghouse resumed its own indexing/abstracting function on January 1, 1975, after a two year hiatus during which the ERIC Facility performed this function for us. All of us now involved in the indexing/abstracting process are new to this activity. Consequently, I do not feel able to provide you with the kind of information you have requested; our experience is simply too limited for us to have developed any fixed patterns.

However, I might point out (although you are probably aware of this) that the Publication/Document Type Code assigned to each document does serve as a supplementary classification system. These codes are searchable on the ERIC tapes, though not in Resources in Education. You might consider an expansion of this Code system.

Also, at the ERIC Technical Meeting in Maryland last December, a consensus was reached on a certain number of "leveling" terms (for example PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, HIGHER EDUCATION, etc.) which are to be mandatory in assignment for documents where a leveling descriptor is appropriate. You might devise three mandatory descriptors for products, programs, and practices.

Sincerely,

Barbara Booth

Barbara Booth
Documents Librarian

ERIC

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY / EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

ERIC Higher Education

SUITE [illegible] / ONE DUPONT CIRCLE / WASHINGTON D.C. 20036 / (202) 296 2597

April 22, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

We received your letter of 11 April concerning improved ease of access to product and program information. Documents processed by our Clearinghouse do not seem to fall into your product, program, or practice categories. Rather, we deal with state of the art, theoretical, or research matter. At this point, I could only answer your questions in a superficial manner. It would be most helpful if you would further clarify your needs in relation to our Clearinghouse. Please feel free to call in order to speed our response time.

I am looking forward to hearing from you and hopefully aiding in improving ERIC'S information retrieval.

Sincerely,

Maryjane Miskel

Maryjane Miskel
Research Assistant

ERIC
ChESS

ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education
855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone (303) 443 2211, Ext. 8434

May 2, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear JoAnn Steiger:

This letter is in response to your inquiry of April 11th, requesting suggestions for ways in which the ERIC system might improve areas for easing educators' access to product and program information.

I believe I must deal with your questions superficially, rather than comprehensively, due to a limit of time. It seems that the area you are trying to cover is so very broad that after you receive replies from various clearinghouses you may want to contact one or more and the ERIC facility for more indepth information.

I find your inquiry of interest because ERIC/ChESS does, in fact, devote attention to distinguishing documentation to meet the varying needs of researchers, practitioners, and others in the field of education.

First, I think it is important to always consider the ERIC indexing system as the coordinate indexing system that it is. We are not limited to using a few descriptors but can index in depth, and always index for major topic, content, process/methods/techniques, instructional level, and type of document.

In indexing and abstracting we consider the user, i.e., how best can the materials be retrieved manually and by computer. We also directly index and abstract the document in hand -- not a related document or another resource -- and index from that point of view. We index generally or very specifically depending upon the specificity of the document. For example, we have extremely broad terms such as Instructional Materials or specific terms to identify products: Textbooks, Manuals, Workbooks, Audiovisual Aids. In indexing a document concerned with audiovisual materials in social studies for grades K-12, we would consider the social studies content to be the most important concept to be indexed and make that a major descriptor. We would also make Audiovisual Materials a major, and Elementary Secondary Education a minor. It is my opinion that, in doing a manual search, most users would look under the descriptor Social Studies First.

With one exception, I am going to answer your questions in the same format as posed by your letter, so that you can follow more easily. The one exception is that I would like to answer number 3. a. after number 1, as I feel it more logically follows 1.

1. a. & 1. b. What descriptors do you use to designate instructional products, programs, & practices.

See the following list. Note that this list is not comprehensive.

DESCRIPTORS

(a) Instructional Products

- Adminstrator Guides
- Art Materials
- Audiovisual Aids
- Autoinstructional Aids
- Books
- Bulletins
- Classroom Games
- Classroom Instruction
- Computer Assisted Instruction
- Curriculum Guides
- Educational Games
- Educational Resources
- Educational Television
- Guides
- Instructional Aids
- Instructional Films
- Instructional Materials
- Instructional Media
- Laboratory Manuals
- Leaders Guides
- Manuals
- Program Guides
- Programed Instruction
- Programed Materials
- Programed Texts
- Programed Units
- Protocol Materials
- Reading Materials
- Resource Guides
- Resource Materials
- Simulation
- Student Developed Materials
- Study Guides
- Supplementary Reading Materials
- Supplementary Textbooks
- Teacher Developed Materials
- Teaching Guides
- Textbooks
- Three Dimensional Aids
- Video Tape Recordings
- Visual Aids
- Workbooks

(b) Programs

- Action Programs (Community)
- Adult Education Programs
- Adult Programs
- After School Programs
- Autoinstructional Programs
- Cocurricular Activities
- Compensatory Education Programs
- Course Content
- Educational Development
- Educational Programs
- Enrichment Programs
- Inservice Teacher Education
- Instructional Programs
- Program Administration
- Program Construction
- Program Content
- Program Coordination
- Program Description
- Program Design
- Program Development
- Program Evaluation
- Program Guide
- Program Improvement
- Program Length
- Program Planning
- Programs
- Projects
- Seminars
- Short Courses
- Special Degree Programs
- Work Experience Programs

Practices

- Activity Learning
- Autoinstructional Methods
- Classroom Techniques
- Concept Teaching
- Conventional Instruction
- Cooperative Teaching
- Creative Teaching
- Cross Age Teaching
- Deductive Methods
- Demonstrations (Educational)
- Diagnostic Teaching
- Discussion (Teaching Technique)
- Educational Methods
- Effective Teaching
- Experimental Teaching
- Field Instruction

Practices (continued)

Group Instruction
Individual Instruction
Individualized Instruction
Inductive Method
Inquiry Training
Inservice Teaching
Instruction
Lead Lecture Plans
Mass Instruction
Microteaching
Multimedia Instruction
Peer Teaching
Precision Teaching
Problem solving
Programed Instruction
Questioning Techniques
Remedial Instruction
Role Playing
Simulation Sociodrama
Student Centered Curriculum
Substitution Drills
Teaching
Teaching Machines
Teaching Methods
Teaching Models
Teaching Procedures
Teaching Programs
Teaching Techniques
Team Teaching
Thematic Approach
Training Techniques

1. c. What additional descriptors, if any, would be of help to system users in retrieving product, program, and practice information? I believe the indexing terms are sufficient for identifying instructional products, programs, and practices. As I'll mention in section 3, identifiers and the institution idex also help in the retrieval of documents.

1. d. What additional descriptors, if any, would help system users retrieve information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field testing or evaluation data are available? The first part of this question seems to border on a judgement on our part. Our role is not evaluate the quality of a program with such a descriptor. Taking into account clearinghouse selection criteria, the fact that a document is selected and inputted suggests that the program offers new knowledge and is somewhat exemplary. We do have terms such as Educational Innovation, Relevance (Education) and others which help capture the idea. Again, however, I can't see educators looking under a descriptor "Exemplary Programs"...it is just too broad. As for the second part of the question, I would again go back to the document -- if the document contained evaluative material per se, I would index for that term with the many descriptors that are now available to use: Course, Curriculum, Program, Evaluation, etc. However, if the document did not contain that information, but referred to evaluative data in another document or if I knew that such evaluation was available, I could indicate this in the abstract, but would not index with an evaluation term.

3. SUBSYSTEMS

a. Do you use any subsystems or supplementary systems to classify product, program, or practice information? If so, please describe. Identifiers as well as the Institutional Source Index, can help educators retrieve programs. All projects are indexed under project names in the identifier field and can be retrieved this way. To improve retrieval in the identifier field, guidelines need to be implemented and followed by clearinghouses.

2. ABSTRACTS

a. What guidelines do you follow in writing abstracts of instructional products, programs, and practices? We follow the ERIC Operating Manual Guidelines. Although not related directly to writing abstracts, I think it is important that educators realize the importance of reading the entire resume. We are asked not to repeat information that is included elsewhere...such as in the title. The source of the document may, but need not, be repeated in the abstract. Important information can be included in the descriptive note, such as related documents.

A good topic sentence giving essential information such as grade level, major subject area and type of documents sets the tone of the abstract and should be included.

Again, to abstract the document in hand is essential. If background information that would be helpful to educators concerning a given program is referenced but is not included in the document -- i.e., can be obtained from another source -- this information can be included in the abstract but there should be differentiation as to what information is and is not included in the document.

b. In what ways could the abstracts be improved to help a practitioner decide which programs, products, and practices to pursue further? Cast the document in the fullest perspective by providing as much essential information as possible. Include, for example, information on availability of described programs. In the selection process, the evaluator needs to make certain that the document does not need helping materials before it can be understood.

It is also helpful to refer the reader to related works.

I do not think that a standardized format for documents lends itself to most materials in ERIC. Each document seems to be fairly unique and should be abstracted to best reflect the document.

c. What additional information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field test or evaluation data are available, should be included in the abstract? As I mentioned previously, all supplementary information that the abstractor feels would be helpful to the user should be included in the abstract, making sure that this information is differentiated between what is and what is not included in the abstract. Also the user should be made aware of the availability of materials and related works.

It is my opindon that the acquisitioning, selecting, processing, and abstracting are complementary to each other. I can give you many examples of this, but will include only a few here. It is most important that the abstractors and indexers be included on what is happening in the other areas.

In acquisitioning, it is important to know what is in RIE and what materials are needed. Consider for example, the Joint Council for Economic Education publication's "Economic Education Experiences of Enterprising Teachers." First of all, we need to know that these documents have all been put into RIE. In the processing of the documents, if we receive more than one it is helpful to number them consecutively so they will be logistically close for users. Abstractors need to be alerted that other documents have been put in and refer back so as not to repeat unnecessary background information and to coordinate terms. A series should be entered as such when possible. The first abstract should give necessary background information and refer readers back to that abstract. My point is that none of the processes can be done in isolation in processing information.

3. b. What, if any, subsystems or supplementary systems do you think would be helpful to practitioners interested in product, program, and practice information? A helpful supplementary system might be an index to report new programs just getting started. It usually takes a while before programs are able to produce reports or materials. An index to new programs could be helpful. Short descriptions could include aims and other helpful information.

May I suggest, again, that before you draw conclusions or try to act upon various ideas and suggestions from clearinghouse responses to this letter that you try to meet with a representative sample of people working in the system such as clearinghouse representatives, various retrieval centers such as RISE, and the ERIC Lexicographer.

I hope I have answered your questions. If you have further questions, please call or write.

Sincerely,

Sydney Meredith

Sydney J. Meredith
Coordinator of Processing

SJM:ec
cc: James Davis

ERIC\ RCS

June 3, 1975

Dr. Steiger:

We are not crazy here, just a little absent minded once in a while.

Our Assistant Director had misfiled the original copy of your letter, finding it today when he was looking for something else.

If we may assist you further, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Fran Biederman

Fran Biederman
Administrative Assistant

fb

ERIC
Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills

April 18, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

I am writing in reply to your letter of April 11th regarding ways in which the ERIC system might improve ease of access to product and program information. I have given quite a bit of thought to this problem myself, though I can't say I've come up with any brilliant ideas.

The ERIC system is designed to answer specific, narrow questions dealing with education. There simply is no way to shortcut the system and rapidly locate vast quatities of documents. Nearly everything in the ERIC system could be categorized as dealing with either a product, a program, or a practice. A large number deal with two or even all three of these. We have no coding system which divides materials into these three categories. The closest we get in this respect are our "Publication/Document Types and Codes" which are machine searchable but are extremely new. (See page 178 of the ERIC Processing Manual).

At our Clearinghouse we make it a practice to attempt to index documents with "form terms" whenever these are applicable. (These include such terms ad "Curriculum Guides," "Program Descriptions," "Study Guides," and "Teaching Guides.") The only terms we assign in addition to form terms and the now-mandatory educational leveling terms are subject terms which describe what the document is about. These subject terms are assigned by our staff on the basis of their perception of the subject matter of each individual document. The only restriction we make is that the indexing terms adequately describe the document.

Some of the descriptors which we might use to describe "products" include: TEXTBOOKS, CLASSROOM MATERIALS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, HANDWRITING MATERIALS, LARGE TYPE MATERIALS, PROGRAM MATERIALS, READING MATERIALS, RESOURCE MATERIALS, STUDENT DEVELOPED MATERIALS, SUPPLEMENTARY READING MATERIALS, TEACHER DEVELOPED MATERIALS, AUDIOVISUAL AIDS, AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, LANGUAGE AIDS, VISUAL AIDS, MANUALS, BOOKS, MULTICULTURAL TEXTBOOKS, SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTBOOKS, HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCABULARY BOOKS, WORDLISTS, FILMS, INSTRUCTIONAL FILMS, FILMSTRIPS, MAGNETIC

TAPE CASETTES, TAPE RECORDINGS, VIDEO TAPE RECORDINGS, PHONOGRAPH RECORDS, SINGLE CONCEPT FILMS, SOUND FILMS, LITERATURE GUIDES, AND STUDY GUIDES. To describe "programs" we might use CURRICULUM GUIDES, TEACHING GUIDES, STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES, or any of the 132 descriptors dealing with "PROGRAMS". The descriptors we would probably use most frequently in describing "practices" are TEACHING METHODS AND TEACHING TECHNIQUES. I am a member of the ERIC Thesaurus Review Group and have suggested a number of new terms for the Thesaurus. However, I cannot recall programs, or practices.

The only guidelings I can offer you on our abstracting are contained in the ERIC processing manual. As for suggestions to help practitioners decide "which products, programs, and practices to pursue further," it seems that what you are asking for is a system whereby exceptional documents in any given area might be flagged for users of the ERIC system. I think that this is a very difficult matter to accomplish. The only system which would be valuable would be an open system in which all users and all abstracters would be aware of the evaluation procedures and the grading system. Any such system would imply government approval and support for the activities of certain educators and, by implication, disapproval of the activities of other educators. There are obviously difficulties with any such system.

The only subsystem I am aware of which would interest you is the "Pubtype" code which I mentioned earlier.

Best wishes on your study. I would be happy to discuss it further with you at your convenience. Yours is a most difficult undertaking.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich
Assistant Director, ERIC/RCS

DJD/ma

Enclosure: Publication/Document Types and Codes
(Revised February 1975)
ERIC Processing Manual

A	Audio Visual/Nonprint Media; Audiovisual Aids; Films; Tape Recordings; Phonotape Recordings; Computer Programs; etc.
B	Books; Monographs; Textbooks; Programmed Texts; etc. (not otherwise classifiable)
C	Curriculum Guides; Curriculum Materials; Teacher-Developed Materials; Laboratory Manuals
D	Directories; Membership Lists; Table of Organization; Reference Works Dealing with Organizations/Institutions; etc.
G	Guides; Teaching Guides; Resource Guides; Study Guides; Administrative Guides; Leaders Guides; Manuals; Training Manuals
H	Legislation, Legislative Hearings, Legislative Reports, Congressional Documents. (Include both Federal and State levels; include National Commissions). Court Cases and Decisions (all levels).
J	Journal Articles; Serials; Periodicals; Bulletins; Newsletters; Newspapers; etc.
K	Program/Project Descriptions; Implementation Efforts
L	Bibliographies; Annotated Bibliographies; Book Catalogs; Abstracts; Literature Reviews; Literature Searches/Guides; Book Lists; Book Reviews; Library Guides; Indexes (Locators); State-of-the-Art Reviews
M	Maps; Atlases; Gazetteers
N	Numerical and Statistical Tables; Quantitative Data and Analyses
O	Other
P	Proceedings; Conference Records/Minutes (entire)
Q	Questionnaires; Tests; Measurement Devices; Evaluation Devices
R	Research Reports; Technical Reports; Studies
S	Speeches; Conference Reports; "Papers presented at...", Verbal Presentations; etc., (not otherwise classifiable)
T	Theses; Dissertations
V	Dictionaries; Vocabularies; Glossaries; Thesauri
Y	Annual Reports; Yearbooks

FIGURE 5-6
PUBLICATION/DOCUMENT TYPES AND CODES

ERIC RCS

April 18, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

I am writing in reply to your letter of April 11th regarding ways in which the ERIC system might improve ease of access to product and program information. I have given quite a bit of thought to this problem myself, though I can't say I've come up with any brilliant ideas.

The ERIC system is designed to answer specific, narrow questions dealing with education. There simply is no way to shortcut the system and rapidly locate vast quatities of documents. Nearly everything in the ERIC system could be categorized as dealing with either a product, a program, or a practice. A large number deal with two or even all three of these. We have no coding system which divides materials into these three categories. The closest we get in this respect are our "Publication/Document Types and Codes" which are machine searchable but are extremely new. (See page 178 of the ERIC Processing Manual.)

At our Clearinghouse we make it a practice to attempt to index documents with "form terms" whenever these are applicable. (These include such terms as "Curriculum Guides," "Program Descriptions," "Study Guides," and "Teaching Guides.") The only terms we assign in addition to form terms and the now-mandatory educational leveling terms are subject terms which describe what the document is about. These subject terms are assigned by our staff on the basis of their perception of the subject matter of each individual document. The only restriction we make is that the indexing terms adequately describe the document.

Some of the descriptors which we might use to describe "products" include: TEXTBOOKS, CLASSROOM MATERIALS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, HANDWRITING MATERIALS, LARGE TYPE MATERIALS, PROGRAM MATERIALS, READING MATERIALS, RESOURCE MATERIALS, STUDENT DEVELOPED MATERIALS, SUPPLEMENTARY READING MATERIALS, TEACHER DEVELOPED MATERIALS, AUDIOVISUAL AIDS, AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, LANGUAGE AIDS, VISUAL AIDS, MANUALS, BOOKS, MULTICULTURAL TEXTBOOKS, SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTBOOKS, HIGH INTEREST LOW VOCABULARY BOOKS, WORDLISTS, FILMS, INSTRUCTIONAL FILMS, FILMSTRIPS, MAGNETIC

ERIC
Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

TAPE CASETTES, TAPE RECORDINGS, VIDEO TAPE RECORDINGS, PHONOGRAPH RECORDS, SINGLE CONCEPT FILMS, SOUND FILMS, LITERATURE GUIDES, AND STUDY GUIDES. To describe "programs" we might use CURRICULUM GUIDES, TEACHING GUIDES, ~~COURSE GUIDES,~~ STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES, or any of the 132 descriptors dealing with "PROGRAMS". The descriptors we would probably use most frequently in describing "practices" are TEACHING METHODS AND TEACHING TECHNIQUES. I am a member of the ERIC Thesaurus Review Group and have suggested a number of new terms for the Thesaurus. However, I cannot recall programs, or practices.

The only guidelines I can offer you on our abstracting are contained in the ERIC processing manual. As for suggestions to help practitioners decide "which products, programs, and practices to pursue further," it seems that what you are asking for is a system whereby exceptional documents in any given area might be flagged for users of the ERIC system. I think that this is a very difficult matter to accomplish. The only system which would be valuable would be an open system in which all users and all abstracters would be aware of the evaluation procedures and the grading system. Any such system would imply government approval and support for the activities of certain educators and, by implication, disapproval of the activities of other educators. There are obviously difficulties with any such system.

The only subsystem I am aware of which would interest you is the "Pubtype" code which I mentioned earlier.

Best wishes on your study. I would be happy to discuss it further with you at your convenience. Yours is a most difficult undertaking.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich

Daniel J. Dieterich
Assistant Director, ERIC/RCS

DJD/ma

ERIC Acc. No.

ERIC **REPORT RESUME Processing Form**

A CH CG009563	B PA	C PDAT Nov74	D ISS	E Copyright? YES ☐ NO ☒	F Repro. Rel? YES ☐ NO ☒	G Avail. Level I ☒ II ☐ II

H1 AUTH

I1 TITL Selected Resources For Drug Information Centers.

J1 INST BBB04871

K1 National Institute on Drug Abuse (DHEW/PHS), Rockville, Maryland
2 National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information

L1 SPON

M1 Public Health Service (DHEW), Rockville, Maryland
2 Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration

N1 CONT

O1 GR

P1 BN

Q PRICE 0.75;1.85

R1 REPNO Ser-8-No-1;DHEW-Pub-No-ADM-75-174

S PUBTYPE J

T1 NOTE 32p.

U1 AVAIL National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information, P.O.Box 1908, Rockville, Marylan
20850

V1 JNL

W1 DESC *Resource Guides; *Drug Abuse; Information Centers; *Information Dissemination; *Opinions; Social Problems; *Social Services; Bibliographies

X1 IDEN

Y1 ABST This listing of books, periodicals, organizations, and other resources in the field of drug abuse was compiled in response to requests by information centers for a guide int a large and expanding field. The resources should be helpful to both a new information center and an established one planning expansion. Not all materials are considered essential for an information center but are of interest to a center emphasizing counselin and mental health, law, community action, or medicine. The materials are classified according to major subject area, and an additional "General" category has been added. (Author/PC)

--- 2614.73)

Elite (12-pitch) typewriters stop at marks

ERIC Acc. No.

ERIC REPORT RESUME Processing Form

CH CG009580	PA	PDAT Aug74	ISS	Copyright? YES ☐ NO ☒	Repro. Rel? YES ☐ NO ☒	Avail. Level I ☒ II ☐

AUTH Azima, Fern J.

TITL Effective Communication in Adolescent Group Psychotherapy.

INST

SPON

CONT

GR

BN

PRICE 0.75;1.50

REPNO

PUBTYPE S

NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention (82nd, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 1974)

AVAIL

JNL

DESC *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Verbal Communication; Research Projects; Adolescents; *Individual Development; *Psychotherapy; Cocounseling; Speeches; *Group Counseling

IDEN

ABST This paper defines a useful strategy for therapists working with adolescents which includes: (1) a general model of the group leader's responsibilities and (2) a cataloguin of some of the specific impediments for both adolescent peers and the therapist that prevent effective communication. The goal of the group therapy is to identify the specific impediments and distorted transference relationships. Unlike conventional leaders the group therapist makes no bid for power. He searches out the silent and negative members spontaneously and, at the same time, is concerned with the group as an effective growing unit. The problems encountered in this context are those of peer transference and leader countertransference as barriers to effective communication. Some transference themes described are: attitudes towards authority and peers; acting out; silence; and somatization or the technique of handling stress by somatic symptoms. Conversely, countertransference reactions of therapists are listed: omnipotence; fear of self-disclosure; overidentification with the adolescent; or somatization and blind spots-i.e. the therapist becomes alerted to his own anxiety or depression by symptoms such a headaches, flushing, nausea, cramps, etc. In summary, the paper presents a general m of the effective group therapist and his major responsibilities for both cognitive positive emotional leadership. (Author/RJ)

RF 26 (4/73)

Elite (12-pitch) typewriters stop at marks

ERIC
Telephone: (313) 764-9492

CAPS Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center
The School of Education, The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

April 24, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, VA 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

In response to your letter of April 11th, we submit the following information which we hope will be of use to you in your current project.

1. Descriptors
   - (a) Used to designate instructional products-- CAPS does not input products per se. Papers written about products bear a term designating the type of product under discussion. e.g. Films, Audiovisual Aids; Video Tape Recordings; Instructional Materials; Resource Materials
   - (b) Used to designate instructional programs and practices--- CAPS does input many documents which fall into this category. We characterize them with descriptor terms such as: Educational Programs; Counseling Programs; Guidance Programs; Computer Oriented Programs; Individualized Programs; Program Descriptions; Counseling Instructional Programs; Consultation Programs; Human Relations Programs; Outreach Programs; Rehabilitation Programs; Youth Programs; Program Guides; Program Development
   - (c) Additional descriptors-- Users might locate information under such terms as: Methods (Educational, Evaluation); Systems Approach; Research Methodology; Caseworker Approach; Field Instruction
   - (d) Exemplary programs--- Although these terms are not in the system, we might consider their input: Evaluated Programs; Field Tested Programs

   NOTE: We would like to see the development of a specific list of terms, similar to the leveling list, whereby each document would have a term which described the type of document it is, to enable users to locate only those types in which they are genuinely interested. CAPS currently uses the following terms: Research Projects; Program Descriptions; Literature Reviews; State of the Art Reviews; Program Evaluation; Resource Materials; Bibliographies; Curriculum Guides; Manuals; etc.

2. Abstracts
   - (a) Abstract guidelines for programs and practices are, of necessity, limited by the authorized 200-word limiation. CAPS attempts to be as informative as possible, presenting information on why and for whom the program or practice was developed, how it was implemented, and the resultant outcomes. Our descriptive field also covers the

document type, population involved and school level (if applicable). (SEE ENCLOSED SAMPLES)

(b) Abstract improvement-- While we must avoid subjective judgements in our abstracting, we should be encouraged to indicate the scope of the target group (limited, number of subjects, extensive) and of the evaluation to help the user determine if, in fact, the program or practice has been adequately researched. Limitations of the research should be clearly delineated.

(c) (See 1d)

3. Sybsystems

(a) CAPS believes strongly in the use of Identifiers as a means of helping the user to locate specific programs and techniques, plus information concerning such programs and techniques. We use Identifiers to denote information on such programs as: Job Corps; Project TALENT; Neighborhood Youth Corps, etc.

(b) Additional Sybsystems-- The more extensive use of Identifiers is currently being encouraged by Central ERIC. CAPS feels that their greater use will be of invaluable assistance to ERIC users.

We trust these suggestions and memos on CAPS way of inputting materials will be of assistance to you. If we can help you further, please feel free to write us.

Sincerely yours,

Carol K. Jaslow

(Mrs.) Carol K. Jaslow
Abstracting and Indexing Editor
ERIC/CAPS

ERIC Acc. No.

REPORT RESUME Processing Form

A CH CG009531 | B PA | C PDAT Aug74 | D ISS | E Copyright? YES ☐ NO X | F Repro. Rel? YES ☐ NO X | G Avail. Level I X II

H1 AUTH Lucas, Donald H.; and others

I1 TITL Psychological Assessment on the Basis of Collage and Group Process.

J1 INST | K1

L1 SPON | M1

N1 CONT | O1 GR | P1 BN

Q PRICE 0.75;1.50 | R1 REPNO | S PUBTYPE K

T1 NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention (82nd, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 1974)

U1 AVAIL

V1 JNL

W1 DESC Program Descriptions; *Psychological Evaluation; *Group Activities; *Self Evaluatio Feedback; *Therapy; Educational Experience; *Institutionalized (Persons)

X1 IDEN

Y1 ABST The traditional psychological assessment approach leaves much to be desired if one considers man to be more than a body or a machine. It fails to consider his humanity, self respect, intentions and goals. The author discusses his own assessment procedure which involves a six-hour structured group with up to 20 patients and eight staff members Structured into this approach are several processes: 1) having the patient participate in his own evaluation; 2) involving the staff and patients in a process of mutual self-disclosure; 3) providing feedback during and at the end of the assessment process; and 4) merging the diagnostic and therapeutic approaches in a timelimited structured group. The group serves at least three functions: diagnostic, therapeutic, and educational. A breakdown, hour by hour, of the group process is provided, as well as suggestions for improving the process. (Author/PC)

ERIC 26 (4/73)

Elite (12-pitch) typewriters stop at marks

ERIC Acc. No.

ERIC **REPORT RESUME Processing Form**

CH CG009554	PA 95	PDAT Jul74	ISS	Copyright? YES [✓ NO]	Repro. Rel? YES [✓ NO]	Avail. Level [✓ I] II III

AUTH Schmieding, Orville; and others

TITL Counselor's Workbook. South Dakota Model.

INST BBB10594

South Dakota Career Education Project, Watertown;
South Dakota Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Pierre,
Career Education

SPON RMQ66000

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

CONT

GR OEG-0-71-4663

BN

PRICE 0.75;4.20

REPNO

PUBTYPE G

NOTE 85p.

AVAIL

JNL

DESC Program Descriptions; Seminars; *Program Planning; *Student Needs; *Accountability; *Counseling Services; Placement; Vocational Development; *Career Planning

IDEN *Elementary Secondary Education

ABST Two one-week Life/Career Guidance, Counseling and Placement Planning Seminars were held for South Dakota school counselors. These seminars were sponsored by SDCE and planned in conjunction with SDSU, Pupil Personnel, and the Division of Vocational-Technical Education. The major thrust of the workshops involved the planning of well-rounded guidance, counseling, and placement programs. Participants were using, for the first time, the South Dakota Counselor's Workbook and student needs assessment data which had been collected prior to the workshops. Input session consisted primarily of life/career topics. Many of the activities and procedures discussed in the input sessions were adopted by the participants as part of their local guidance program. The end result of the workshops was the development of guidance programs based on student needs which will serve as local counselor accountability models. (Author)

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

ERIC Clearinghouse in Career Education
204 Gabel Hall
815 753 1251

May 28, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

As you requested, the staff of ERIC/CICE have studied your questions which relate to your research project on how ERIC might be improved to ease access to product and program information. The following information is submitted to help you in drafting recommendations:

1. Descriptors
   a. What descriptors do you use to designate instructional products?

      Curriculum Guides
      State Curriculum Guides
      Resource Guides
      Study Guides
      Teaching Guides
      Leaders Guides
      Manuals
      Textbooks
      Instructional Materials
      Classroom Materials
      Instructional Aides
      Autoinstructional Aides
      Programed Materials
      Programed Texts
      Student Developed Materials
      Teacher Developed Materials
      Workbooks
      Worksheets
      Games
      Classroom Games
      Educational Games
      Simulation

   b. What descriptors do you use to designate instructional programs and practices?

      Program Descriptions
      Instructional Programs
      Educational Programs
      Adult Education Programs
      Field Experience Programs
      Institutes (Training Programs)
      Internship Programs
      Teaching Programs
      Work Experience Programs

Northern Illinois University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Cooperative Education
Teaching Methods (and Narrower Terms)
Teaching Techniques

c. What additional descriptors, if any, would help system users retrieve product information? Program and practice information?

This category may present problems to users because many descriptors are used for documents which are programs and practices and also for documents which are about programs and practices.

d. What additional descriptors, if any, would help system users retrieve information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field testing or evaluation data are available?

We badly need Field Testing as a descriptor, we are at present using it as an identifier. We can, and do use

Program Evaluation
Demonstration Programs
Demonstration Projects
Pilot Projects

We probably need Exemplary Programs as a descriptor.

It is very difficult to answer this question because we do not know what the user wants to retrieve. We receive no feed back from users and so have no idea whether we are meeting their needs - thus it is impossible to say much about new descriptors which would help us serve the user better when we don't know how or even if, we are serving him now.

2. Abstracts

a. What guidelines do you follow in writing abstracts of instructional products? Of programs and practices?

For instructional products such as curriculum guides, we include reference to grade level, subject level, orientation (e.g. subject, concept, or objective) level of detail (e.g. is it very specific or general, to be built on by the teacher) and format (e.g. description of a typical lesson plan).

For instructional materials we attempt to describe what is offered, although in some cases the variety of materials offered makes it impossible to do more than generalize. For program descriptions we should describe the program, where it is carried out if relevant, who it is aimed for (e.g. grade level, educational level, etc.) and include any internal or external evaluation made of the program and its accomplishments.

b. In what ways could the abstracts be improved to help a practitioner decide which products, programs and practices to pursue further?

The abstractors are charged with describing the document on hand. We do not know what the practitioner wants, so it is difficult for us to say how our abstracts could help him better.

c. What additional information about exemplary products or programs, particularly those for which field test or evaluation data are available, should be included in the abstract?

If the abstractor feels that additional information should be included in an abstract then he/she should write a better abstract. An abstract is supposed to provide complete coverage of the document, although within our 200 word limit the coverage sometimes has to be general rather than detailed.

As for question 3, my staff and I do not have any reactions to it. We look forward to receiving your draft for further comment.

Sincerely,

John A. Niemi

John A. Niemi
Associate Director

JAN:dmz
cc: David V. Tiedeman

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305 (415) 497-3345

Specializing in Materials and Strategies for Learning

May 29, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Rd.
McLean, Va. 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger,

As the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, we are not as likely as a subject-based clearinghouse to receive instructional products. However, we have had experience in conducting computer searches of the ERIC data bases, and, in our capacity as the Clearinghouse on media and technology, we have developed some expertise in locating instructional media and materials.

We feel that the ERIC data base as it is now constituted would need some revision to allow it to be useful in retrieving instructional materials. Some sort of file partition, perhaps similar to AIM/ARM, would be needed, so that valuable time would not be lost in searching through thousands of items that were not relevant to the search request. The system should be compatible with ERIC, and be presented either as a sub-section of RIE or as a companion volume. It should be computer searchers and should have the capability to offer quantity discounts for orders over a given volume. It is unlikely that the microfiche format would be useful for this material as the schools would need the hardcopy form for student use. Perhaps it would be best to have microfiche available for a low-cost "first look" at the program and then the capability to offer offset masters or camera ready copy directly from the system.

In addition, the ERIC data base at the present time does not include non-print materials. A revision of the indexing system would be necessary in order to retrieve non-print materials desired by the searcher. That is, a school that had a dial access retrieval system to distribute audiovisual materials from a central source would have a use for a wide variety of media, but a school with only sound filmstrip projectors would have little or no use for media in other forms. At the present time there is no way for the ERIC system to identify specific forms of media. The descriptor field is already used to designate the content of the document and its use to identify form or medium would only confuse the searcher. The publication type field has only one alpha character (A) to identify audiovisual materials. This would not be specific enough to limit material to the types of media desired.

Some of the Educational Information Centers have been using the ERIC system as a basis for indexing their in-house collections of instructional materials, such as LAPS and UNIPACS. They should be queried so that the system would have the benefit of their experience.

There are already some computerized systems which control audiovisual programs. The most widely know is the NICEM system. It is operated out of the University of Southern California and prepares printed indexes to various media using a computerized data base as a source. Some investigation into their system might prove fruitful. It may be that on-line access to the NICEM data base would be a cost effective way to provide the access to media educators need.

Valuable information could also be gained by contacting the American Associatio of School Librarians, a division of the American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill. This professional group is the most active in the area of library/media programs and could be an effective part of the development of a program of access to instructional products, programs, and practices.

Attached is a response to the specific questions asked in your letter. We would be happy to participate in any way possible in this proposed system. Please feel free to contact us as you feel necessary.

Sincerely,

Judith Yarborough

Judith Yarborough
Assistant Director

A. Descriptors used to designate instructional products

Educational Programs
Curriculum Guides
Computer Programs
Textbooks
History Textbooks
Programed Texts
Study Guides
Teaching Guides
Instructional Programs
Teaching Programs
Multicultural Textbooks
Supplementary Textbooks
Instructional Materials
Instructional Media

B. Descriptors used to designate instructional programs and practices

Educational Programs
Instructional Programs
Program Descriptions
Program Evaluation
Teaching Procedures
Educational Strategies
Teaching Techniques
Teaching Methods
Teaching Models
Effective Teaching

C&D. Additional Descriptors

Additional descriptors may not serve the purpose intended as they will be mixed with content descriptors. It would then be impossible to sort a book about preparing instructional materials from the instructional materials themselves. Some new field is needed which would be reserved for a designation of the form of media of the document or program.

2. Abstracts

A. Guidelines for abstracts of instructional products--The Clearinghouse has no established guidelines for abstracting other than those that are set forth in the ERIC Processing manual.

B. Abstracts of instructional programs, practices, and products could be improved if there were a special section added to the ERIC Processing Manual which specified material to be covered an format to be used.

The extent of validations, field tests, and evaluation data available for the program could also be noted in the abstract. The disadvantage to this practice, if it is not supplemented by some field that contains the information in a machine readable form, is that the searcher could not limit the output of a computer search to only those programs, practices, and products which have reached a given level of evaluation/revision.

3. As mentioned in the accompanying letter there presently exists, in some form, several attempts to control the reservoir of instructional materials. These include NICEM, in-house programs at Educational Information Centers, and the Instructional Systems Clearinghouse (formerly TAP), as well as the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE).

NICEM

University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, Calif. 90007

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
463 West St.
New York, N.Y. 10014

Instructional Systems Clearinhouse. Inc.
337 Winegar St.
Monmouth, Ore. 97361

JY:vp

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children

May 29, 1975

Dear Dr. Steiger,

We are glad to hear of increasing concern about using the ERIC system to improve access to instructional materials. It is an area that our Clearinghouse has an interest in and has considered developing. At the present time, however, we do not enter products, by your definition, into the system. We limit our acquisitions to professional materials and do not include the infinite number of instructional materials now on the market.

Carl Oldsen, previously the Assistant Director of the CEC Information Center, and now at the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, chaired a committee which developed and published an Instructional Materials Thesaurus for Special Education. This was developed with eventual correlation with the ERIC thesaurus in mind though all the included terms are not ERIC descriptors. The thesaurus has been included in the ERIC system (ED 101492) and can be obtained from them. You might also be interested in contacting Mr. Oldsen. He would be able to explain to you the criteria used to select terms and the process used to develop the thesaurus. The thesaurus contains an alphabetical section (which includes a definition for each term), a rotated arrangement, a categorical arrangement, and instructions for indexing instructional materials. Mr. Oldsen's address is as follows:

Carl F. Oldsen
National Center on Educational Media and Materials
for the Handicapped
220 West 12th Ave.
Columbus, Ohio, 43210
(614) 422-7596

Since we abstract and index instructional materials only in a peripheral way, i.e. when they are discussed in a professional document, we have not found a need for a detailed breakdown of terms. The following are relevant descriptors in our "Thesaurus for Exceptional Child Education", a subset of the ERIC thesaurus.

Instructional Materials
Instructional Media
Instructional Materials Centers
Audiovisual Aids
Educational Technology
Games
Workbooks
Large Type Materials
Manipulative Materials
Programed Materials
Student Developed Materials
Material Development
Tactile Adaptation
Media Technology
Teaching Methods
Program Descriptions
Toys
Teacher Developed Materials

Affiliated with the CEC Information Center
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Because we do not abstract instructional materials we do not have any specific abstracting policies for them. When abstracting documents about instructional materials we follow the policies outlined in the ERIC Processing Manual.

If ERIC does get involved in the instructional materials area the most valuable information (and also the thorniest) to be included in an abstract would surely be evaluative information such as the results of field testing and outside review evaluations.

Regarding program and practice, we are abstracting considerably more of the teacher oriented types of documents but have so far found the present ERIC descriptors quite adequate.

I hope this information is of some help to you. It's good to see ERIC more concerned with the needs of educational practitioners.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Bloch

Dorothy Bloch
Coordinator of Information Services

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Response to Questionnaire on Access to Instructional Products, Programs, and Practices

1. Descriptors

a) Descriptors which may be used to designate instructional products :

- Instructional Materials
- Classroom Materials
- Workbooks
- Manuals
- Reading Materials
- Educational Games
- Curriculum Guides
- Teaching Guides
- State Curriculum Guides
- Instructional Aides
- Worksheets
- Student Developed Materials
- Teacher Developed Materials
- Visual Aids
- Toys
- Talking Books
- Supplementary Textbooks
- Science Materials
- Orientation Materials
- Programmed Materials
- Textbooks
- Multi-cultural Textbooks
- Programmed Texts
- History Textbooks

b) Descriptors which may be used to designate instructional programs and practices :

- Instructional Programs
- Compensatory Education Programs
- Teaching Procedures
- Teaching Techniques
- Teaching Methods
- Teaching Styles
- Student Central Curriculum
- After School Programs
- Program Content
- Course Content
- Auto-instructional Methods
- Conventional Instruction
- Group Instruction
- Individual Instruction
- Individualized Instruction
- Multi-media Instruction
- Programmed Instruction
- Remedial Instruction
- Team Teaching
- Sequential Programs
- Diagnostic Teaching
- Small Group Instruction
- Classroom Techniques

Note: The descriptors listed in (a) and (b) above are of course used in conjunction with other descriptors to fully describe a given document. For example, "Grade 4" and "Textbook Evaluation" would be added to "Reading Materials" to describe a document which deals with the evaluation of reading texts for Grade 4. Another example would be adding "Dropout Prevention" and "Puerto Ricans" to "After School Programs" to describe a document which deals with using after school programs to reduce Puerto Rican students from dropping out of school.

c) Additional suggested descriptors for instructional products, programs, and practices :

The Urban Education Clearinghouse staff feels that there are sufficient descriptors in the current ERIC Thesaurus to describe documents which are or deal with instructional products, practices and programs. In addition, the machine retrievable "publication type" field should help in identifying particular publications of interest to educational practitioners.

d) Additional suggested descriptors for exemplary products and programs :

The terms "Exemplary Products" and "Exemplary Programs" might be added to the ERIC Thesaurus. Scope notes would have to accompany them, however, stating that the products or programs were deemed "exemplary" by some outside evaluation, and were not deemed so by the ERIC system. Great care would have to be exercised by the indexors in assigning these terms to particular documents. Many programs have met with some success, but not all would be "exemplary".

2. Abstracts

a) Guidelines:

The abstracting staff of The Urban Education Clearinghouse follows the guidelines found in The ERIC Processing Manual. Instructional products and descriptions of programs and practices usually require an indicative abstract; that is, an abstract written from the viewpoint of an informal but impartial reader and which reports on what is discussed or included in the document, the manner in which the information is presented, and, if necessary, to whom the document is addressed. Sample Abstracts are attached.

b) Improvement:

Ideally, a reading of the entire entry for a given document (title, author(s), institutional source(s), descriptors, identifiers, notes, abstract) gives one a good idea of what the document is about and whether one wants to further pursue the material. Carefully written abstracts which fully and objectively describe a product, program, or practice as presented in the particular documents at hand should be helpful to practitioners.

c) Exemplary products, programs, practices :

Any major points of information contained in a document should, of course, be reflected in the abstract. If a document contains results of field testing or evaluation, these should be mentioned in the abstract.

3. Subsystems

a) The "publication type" field which is filled in for all ERIC documents is a type of "subsystem" and, as mentioned above, should be helpful to educational practitioners in identifying particular materials.

b) Recently grade level descriptors were standardized and made mandatory for all appropriate documents. Perhaps a small group of standardized descriptors should be decided upon for all appropriate documents which are or deal with instructional products, programs, and practices. For example, all instructional products, whether a textbook or a toy, would be given the descriptor "Instructional Materials". (It might also be given a more specific term, if necessary, such as "History Textbooks"). This would provide an additional identification tag for these particular documents. A separate directory for exemplary products, programs and practices perhaps should be created with citation and abstract formats specially designed for these particular documents.

Prepared by :

Jean Barabas
Assistant Director

Raja Jayatilleke
Processing Coordinator.

[illegible]

CH UD014632 PA PDAT 74 ISS

Copyright? [✓ YES] NO Repro. Rel? [✓ YES] NO Avail. Level [✓ I] II III

AUTH

TITL The Chinese Bilingual Pilot Program, ESEA Title VII, 1974: Program Guide.

INST BBB05693 San Francisco Unified School District, Calif.

SPON

CONT

GR

BN

PRICE 0.75;1.85

REPNO

PUBTYPE C

NOTE 39p.

AVAIL

JNL

DESC *Chinese; *Second Language Learning; *Bilingual Education; *Program Guides; Program Descriptions; Curriculum Development; Elementary School Curriculum; Secondary School Curriculum; Team Teaching; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Reading Programs; Conversational Language Courses

IDEN * San Francisco; California; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII

ABST The 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII Chinese Bilingual Pilot Program is a bilingual/bicultural program the purpose of which is to provide for the special educational needs of children who have limited English-speaking ability, who come from environments where the dominant language is one other than English, and who come from low-income families. The program is charged with developing and disseminating Chinese bilingual/bicultural curriculum materials, providing instruction in both English and Cantonese in the basic subject areas, providing the parents of our students with second language instruction in English and Cantonese, and developing an educational prototype which might serve as a replicable model for the development of a K-12 bilingual/bicultural program. A student in the program divides his school time between two teachers in two different classrooms: an English component class and a Chinese bilingual component class. The student will spend half the day in one class and the other half in the other. In some grades the alternation between components is every other day. The students are offered the following subjects: English reading and writing, Chinese reading and writing, spoken English, spoken Cantonese, mathematics, social studi science, music, physical education, and art. (Author/JM)

AUTH_

TITL_ Equal Rights: An Intergroup Education Curriculum.

INST_ BBB09096 Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Curriculum Services

SPON_ RMQ66000 Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

CONT_

GR_

BN_

PRICE_ 0.75;11.40

REPNO_

PUBTYPE_ C

NOTE_ 247p.

AVAIL_

JNL_

DESC_ *Intergroup Education; *Civil Rights; *Elementary School Curriculum; *Secondary School Curriculum; Curriculum Development; Racial Attitudes; Social Attitudes; Sex Stereotypes; Educational Opportunities; Equal Education; Early Childhood Education; Class Activities; Community Involvement

IDEN_ *Pennsylvania; Civil Rights Act of 1964

ABST_ This curriculum, the development of which was funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, will aid teachers and school administrators in their efforts to explore with students the attitudes and skills essential to friendly and democratic relations between persons of different races, religions, national origins, and socioeconomic status and both sexes. The curriculum includes five components: (1) suggested ways of structuring effective learning activities for intergroup education which stress involvement, participation and realism; (2) the "Intergroup Education Curriculum"; (a) a conceptual framework for teachers and students to operate within; (b) explanatory material which elaborates the meaning and significance of 12 key concepts; (c) a set of common objectives, drawn from the concepts, to provide a focus for each curriculum area; and, (d) sections for each of eight curriculum areas--Arts, Early Childhood Education, Health and Physical Education, Industrial Arts, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies; (3) suggested ways of using the group life of the school as a source for class activities and a means of assuring the behavioral outcomes of the curriculum approaches; (4) suggested ways of involving the community as an important resource for intergroup education; and, (5) supplemental information in the "Appendices" which can be used as an instructional resource for the classroom and in-service staff development programs. (Author/JM)

ERIC ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TESTS, MEASUREMENT, & EVALUATION
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

May 29, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Dr. Steiger:

The Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation rarely processes instructional products for announcement in Resources in Education (RIE) due to the nature of our scope of interest. However, there are a few comments we would like to make about ways of handling instructional products and program information.

1. DESCRIPTORS
    a. Generally we would use INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS as a descriptor for instructional products. Whenever possible a more specific descriptor would be used such as TALKING BOOKS, EDUCATIONAL GAMES or FLES MATERIALS, etc.

    b. To designate instructional programs we would use the descriptor, INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS; for instructional practices, the descriptors, TEACHING METHODS or TEACHING PROCEDURES.

    c. Descriptors to cover document types -- i.e. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS (DOCUMENT TYPE) or TEACHING PROCEDURES (DOCUMENT TYPE) -- would be useful. In this way the user could retrieve only those documents that are instructional programs or teaching procedures as opposed to those which describe or discuss them. For the user who seeks information on a specific program or procedure, the use of an identifier is essential. Thus a user interested in the ABC Reading Program could retrieve all information on the program using the title. In order to effectively retrieve information in this manner, there must be mandatory use of identifiers on documents of this type and standardization in the use of titles for programs and products. The Labs and Centers who produce materials should be encouraged to be consistent in the use of product names in their reports.

    d. Certainly a descriptor, EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS or VALIDATED PROGRAMS would help. Through coordinate indexing documents could be retrieved which are exemplary or validated instructional programs (see 1-c above) or which describe such programs.

TELEPHONE: 609-921-9000

2. ABSTRACTS
   a. To abstract an instructional product we would follow the basic guidelines for abstracting established in the ERIC Operating Manual. Frequently, ERIC/TM abstracts a test. The guidelines we have established for handling tests are attached.

   b. Practitioner oriented abstracts should include information concerning the target population (i.e. high school students who read on a third to sixth grade level); the need for expensive or readily available equipment; the qualifications of instructional staff needed to carry out the program effectively; the model or philosophy upon which the materials are based (i.e. Piagetian Model); and the availability of information concerning the validity and effectiveness of the materials.

   c. The abstract for exemplary programs should identify the context in which the program was judged to be exemplary. For example, it is one thing to know that a reading program is judged exemplary based on its use in wealthy suburban schools, as opposed to inner city schools. It is important to know the number of subjects participating in the evaluation. Whether the evaluation was done by the product developer or an unbiased party is also useful.

3. SUBSYSTEMS
   a. No

   b. To best serve the needs of practitioners it might be desirable to have a separate branch of ERIC for instructional materials. It could operate much the same way as CIJE. The vocabulary would be the same but the cataloging is geared specifically to instructional materials. I think to overload an abstract may not be effective or efficient. Perhaps cataloging essential items such as personnel requirements, student characteristics, type of equipment needed, amount of time involved, would be more effective.

Sincerely,

Eleanor V. Horne

Eleanor V. Horne
Assistant Director

EVH:mlp
Enclosure

Memorandum for: ERIC/TM Staff

Subject: Abstracts of Tests

Date: October 13, 1970

From: R.O. Fortna

From time to time our Clearinghouse will be processing tests and documents which contain tests for RIE. While the abstracting of tests must be standard, resumes for the two groups will be handled somewhat differently.

Group A - Tests without a supporting document

These tests will be handled as a single document and will require only one Resume Form. In the case of published, standardized tests we will most often be handling them as Level III documents; however, there will be cases where the author or publisher will permit us to put the test in at Level I or II.

Group B - Tests with a supporting document

In all cases where documents contain tests they must be assigned consecutive TM numbers; therefore, as documents are received and accessioned they must be checked for inclusion of tests.

Documents which contain tests will be handled as two separate papers and will require two resume forms. One resume will be prepared for the document and the abstract will indicate only that a test is included. In all cases, the document and test will be entered at the level indicated by the author--most times as Level I we hope. A second resume will be prepared for the test itself and it will always be entered at Level III. An entry will be made in the availability field listing the TM number of the document which contains the test. Invariably this should be the preceding TM number. Entering these tests at Level III will accomplish two major objectives. First, it will prevent duplication of microfiche in ERIC and second, it will ensure that a person interested in the test will obtain all supporting material by requiring him to obtain the document and test together.

Regardless of the level of input or the source (Group A or B) it is imperative that we standardize our abstracting of tests to ensure consistency in terms of content and style. What follows is an adaptation of the content of three systems in present use--Buros, Cronbach and ETS Test Collection--which fits the requirements of the ERIC Report Resume and covers essential points of information about a test. Lines 1-11 of the Report Resume will contain the following--Author, Title, Publication Date, Publisher or Source, Availability and Pagination while the abstract should be constructed using the outline below. Be sure to include all information available on the test.

1. Purpose of the test, type, and group(s) for which interded.

   a. Purpose
   b. Forms and levels
   c. Grades or ages
   d. Classification (Aptitude, sales status, etc.)
   e. Individual or group
   f. Verbal or nonverbal
   g. Item type(s)
   h. Response mode

2. Administration
   a. Special equipment (props, tape recorders, etc.)
   b. Qualifications to administer
   c. Time limits

3. Scoring
   a. Method (hand, machine, etc.)
   b. Subscores

4. Interpretation
   a. Manuals
   b. Supporting materials
   c. Norms (type)

5. Standardization
   a. Reliability
   b. Validity

Descriptors for tests should always include Tests as a major term and the remaining terms should be used to supplement the information in the abstract. For example, an Algebra Test might be cataloged using the following descriptors: Achievement Tests, Algebra, Grade 9, Group Tests, Multiple Choice Tests, Tests.

A sample of a completed test resume is attached.

ERIC ACC. NO.

CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
TM 000 014		Aug 69	

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☐
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☐
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☐ II ☒ III ☐

AUTHOR
Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.

TITLE
Test of Oral English Production.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
XAP81900	

SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66004	

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25	OEC-4-7-062827-3078	

REPORT NO.	BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., 117 Richmond Drive, N.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE 55p.

DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Language Development; Language Fluency; Language Programs; *Primary Grades; Program Evaluation; Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking Children; Test Construction; *Tests

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

This is an individually administered test designed to evaluate programs that teach English as a second language, specifically the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory's (SWCEL) Oral Language Program for children in the primary grades. A major goal of the test is to elicit responses in as "spontaneous" a manner as possible in order to arrive at a reasonably realistic assessment of a child's speech. Test materials consist of an administrator's manual and a kit of props which provide stimuli for the desired, tape recorded, children's responsc No special skills are required to administer the test. Classroom teachers, familiar with the directions, stimuli, desired responses, and use of the pro can administer the test in about 10-15 minutes. While pronunciation and voc items are included, major emphasis is upon grammatical competence. Scoring done at the SWCEL from the taped conversation. A total score and two part sc (Vocabulary and Pronunciation--items 3-26, and Use of English Grammatical Structures--items 27-83) may be obtained. The test is not standardized; however, field testing of the instrument has provided general categories of scores which permit classification of groups of students in terms of English fluency and data o reliability and validity. (RF)

Career
Education
Curriculum
Laboratory

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY / Johnston Building / 415 N. Monroe Street / Tallahassee, Florida 32301 / 904-644-3066

September 2, 1975

Dr. Jo Ann M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Steiger:

Your memo of July 30, 1975 arrived in my office on August 13; I am unable to meet your August 15 deadline for comments to be included in your final report.

I was disappointed that the listing of telephone interviews did not include anyone from North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, or Taxas; these states have active dissemination programs and may have valuable input.

Hopefully, your report will be available for discussion at the next ERIC Data Base Users Conference this Fall. I look forward to receiving a copy.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hancock
Information Services Division

REH:p

Northwest
Regional
Educational
Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue • Portland, Oregon 97204 • Telephone (503) 248-6800

August 14, 1975

Dr. Jo Ann M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
Education Research and Development
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

I have been asked by Dr. Larry Fish to respond to your NIE paper related to the retrieval of information on educational products, programs and practices from ERIC.

During a five-year period with the Northwest Regional Special Education Instructional Materials Center, in Eugene, Oregon, and previous years' experience in high school curriculum work, I had extensive opportunities to interact with teachers who were asking the questions you are dealing with. I have several responses.

1. a) Have you had any interaction with the National Center for Educational Materials and Media for the Handicapped at Ohio State University in Columbus on the coding/indexing of materials? They've been charged with developing a good system; whether the charge has been accomplished I haven't recently heard. They can be reached at: 222 West 12th, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (614) 586-2400.

   b) Have you had any communications with the people who developed the SelectEd, Inc. "Prescriptive Materials Retrieval System?" Their developers have dealt with a number of your questions, and they might just have some useful data for you. They can be reached at Select Education, 152 Pico Blvd., Santa Monica, CA 90405 (213) 392-3985.

   c) How about EPIE? Have you been in touch with them? (Educational Products Information Exchange, EPIE Institute, 463 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014 (212) 675-1163).

2. Page 17, SUBJECT: Might we not consider both major and minor areas of subject matter, in that many materials have several distinct uses, such as games or simulations (which may teach both skills and content) or materials which might be thought of in their broad context, such as (ECONOMICS) but also in their narrower sense, (CONSUMER SPENDING or HOUSEHOLD FINANCE). There is a need for the specific as well as the general in retrieving instructional materials, particularly if the data base is going to become a large one.

3. Page 17, SUBJECT: In discussing "objectives" we are going to run smack into several types, such as "long and short range objectives," "teacher or student objectives," or "class vs. individual objectives." Will we need to expand or clarify?

4. Page 17, TARGET AUDIENCE: Has the term "proficiency level" yet been standardized enough to be used as a descriptor? And if not, is there to be a set of proficiencies against which abstractors may measure the materials they are working with? (reading level and grade level are two other such hazy, ill-defined words, and have driven those who describe and classify instructional materials more than a little mad. Let's not make proficiency level still a third!)

5. Page 17, FORMAT: The concept of medium may need expansion into audiovisual format descriptors. Multi-media kits and other products dealing with assorted materials and techniques demand of the user a knowledge of appropriate projectors and other equipment for their use. Will the user be able to ascertain from the abstract (or from some other source) which equipment will be necessary to successfully utilize the product?

6. Page 17, EFFECTIVENESS: In using the term "outcomes," will the guidelines differentiate for abstractors between outcomes and objectives? Definition may be needed.

7. Pages 19-23: These paragraphs are helpful expansions of page 17. Will there be enough of this sort of expansion that each of the details of page 17 is clarified?

8. Would there be justification for coding materials which are particularly appropriate for teaching to the cognitive or affective or psychomotor domains? The humanistic education groups ask for these, and the movement gets stronger daily.

I'm pleased to see that we are working on such a project. It hasn't seemed possible for business interests to develop such a system, and education certainly needs one. I hope there is a way by which two systems, ERIC and ERIC MATERIALS, can be developed AND RELATED, so that we are not hamstrung by problems such as the incomplete process we must use now for identifying AIM/ARM materials within the ERIC files. Particularly in the area of effectiveness of materials, we are going to need to have ties between ERIC and ERIC MATERIALS, in order to retrieve all the pertinent research and reporting.

Good luck. Let me know your next steps; I'd be happy to continue to react or even to be involved in other steps in the process, if I could be helpful to it.

Cheers,

M. Maggie Rogers

MMR:ly

I
ChESS

855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone (303) 492-8434

August 25, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M Steiger
East Coast Office
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Since we have had such difficulty in getting together by telephone, I will respond to your letter of July 30 in writing. I will pick up the various concerns and recommendations pretty much in the order in which they appear in your paper.

1. Practitioner-Oriented Document

Two kinds of documents should be considered under this heading. First, "how-to" materials oriented primarily to how to do things in the classroom. The second kind would be curriculum materials, that is, actual materials for use in the classroom.

With respect to "how-to" materials there would be two major sources--documents that come in from the field and documents that are produced by the clearinghouses. It is probably true that there are not very many documents that come in from the field that would meet this need. To the extent that such documents are available and of reasonably good quality, I am sure this clearinghouse would put in all the documents that are available to it and I expect the same would be true of most other clearinghouses. With respect to the production of "how-to" documents I am sure you are familiar with the "information analysis" products that are a major activity of all the clearinghouses. The majority of information analysis products produced by this clearinghouse would fall in to the "how-to" category and I think this is true of many other clearinghouses. We have, for example, produced a series of "tips" papers on the teaching of particular kinds of subjects and have also produced a number of publications that suggest additional resource materials. We also published a series of 45 "Profiles of Promise" which documented creative classroom programs or practices that had originated in schools throughout the country.

2. Need for Curriculum Materials

The second kind of practitioner-oriented documents, and one which is a major concern in your paper, consists of curriculum materials. You are, no doubt, familiar with the history of the ERIC system and with the fact that there was very little emphasis on curriculum materials at the beginning of the system and substantial restrictions on the quantity of curriculum materials that could be entered into the system for quite a few years. This is now changed and a greater number of curriculum materials have been put into this system more recently. I think this is an appropriate shift:

however, I still think that some limitation needs to be put on the volume of curriculum materials--the potential volume could overwhelm the system--and that substantial weight should still be given to the needs of administrators and curriculum planners, needs that are met only in part by curriculum materials and require also a lot of other types of input.

3. A Separate System for Curriculum Materials

As long as access to curriculum materials within the existing system is reasonably good--a matter dealt with below--I can see no reason for establishing a separate system for curriculum materials.

4. Retrieval of Documents on Educational Products, Programs, and Practices

I don't think the situation is nearly as bad as indicated by your list of hundreds of descriptors that might be used for this type of search. With the joint use of several well chosen descriptors--particularly including subject area descriptors--it is not so difficult to zero in on the type of document desired. The system could always be improved, of course, but it seems to me that with an operating system such as ERIC, this must be a slow and step-wise procedure such as is part of the continuing process of our operation. You mentioned particularly the possibility of a more hierarchical system of descriptors. The system of "broader terms," "narrower terms," and "related terms" provides a hierarchy of sorts, although on a rather atomistic basis. To make the system more hiearchical than this would require a vast undertaking. If done, I would think this would have to be a separate research undertaking that would proceed parallel to the continued operation of the system and might conceivably result in a drastic change in the system at some point in time. Meanwhile, however, the Thesaurus is not bad.

5. How to Find Evaluated Materials

Access to evaluations of curriculum materials would be an extremely useful tool for educators. The problem of doing this through the ERIC system is that evaluations of materials are extremely scarce and while access to such evaluations might be useful, there is always the second question of judging whether the evaluations are sound. I think that what is needed is a lot of special work on evaluation of curriculum materials and special publications which would help educators in this respect. I am dubious about whether some special method of locating evaluated materials in the ERIC system would pay off very much, primarily because of the scarcity of such evaluations.

6. Uniformity of Abstracts

The paper expresses a substantial concern for lack of uniformity in abstracts of curriculum materials. Perhaps a more descriptive set of guidelines would be useful. However, I think the writing of such guidelines should be preceeded by an effort on the part of CERIC to do a good bit of substantive editing of these abstracts with a view to reducing the variation in them; and then on the basis of such editing and of confering with clearinghouses, a useful set of guidelines that would bring about more uniformity might be produced. With respect to the particular items to be covered in such abstracts outlined on pages 19-22 of the paper, I think most of these are appropriate, and many are now being done. However, there would be substantial difficulty with some of the items under 3, "special attributes." "Instructional principles or rationale upon which the materials are based" are usually not stated in curriculum materials. They can be inferred by someone who is skilled in analysis of materials and who has sufficient time to do such an analysis. But I do not think this is feasible in the case of abstracting which must be done in very limited time. Similar comment would apply "to the role of the instructor" and "the role of the learner." These roles might or might not be specified in the materials and if not specified, might require considerable expertise and time to infer. With respect to item 5, "Costs and Prerequisites," the item on "required staff training" and perhaps some of the others would require in many cases a considerable inferential leap on the part of an abstractor. Finally, the full outline of items suggested here might push the space limitations beyond a feasible limit.

7. Use of Pubtype Codes

I think the institution of the existing pubtype code was an important step forward for the system. However, there are a couple of revisions that I think would be useful in line with your objective of making curriculum materials more readily available. The distinction between "C" and "G" in the present code is very clear in my mind. "C" should refer to curriculum materials, that is, things for classroom use, whereas "G" refers to resource materials for teachers, including teacher guides. I think this is a clear and useful distinction: however, to follow it through, it would be necessary to transfer "curriculum guides" from "C" to "G" and also as you suggest to transfer textbooks and program texts from "B" to "C". I would not expect to find, as you suggest, that curriculum materials would be formed under K, O, or Q. Program and project descriptions would be searched under K and I think this is an appropriated distinction from the codes for curriculum materials "C" and teaching resources "G".

8. A Coding System

I'm not sure I understand the suggestions on pages 10-12. It sounds as though they are prescribing a system of numbers to replace a system of words. If this is a correct interpretation, it seems to me this would be a backward step.

I would be happy to discuss our ideas on these matters with you further. In view of our difficulty arriving at a telephone connection, I thought you would like to have these comments in writing.

Best wishes with your project.

Sincerely,

Irving Morrissett
Director

IM/cr
cc: Del Trester

AASA
NASE

AASA • National Academy for School Executives

August 19, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
Education Research and Development
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

In response to your recent correspondence relative to improvement of the ERIC system, I have reviewed your manuscript from the standpoint of interest of the practicing school administrator. This is obviously because the American Association for School Administrators serves practicing administrators around the country and they comprise the bulk of our membership and clientele.

Relative to the alternative strategies described in your paper, I propose that for the long run the standardization of descriptors alternative is the most feasible even though it would require revision of descriptors already in the ERIC collection. I think anything less than this would be essentially a rather small tinkering with the descriptor system when probably a rather dramatic change initiated in one swoop is what is necessary.

Beyond this recommendation relative to alternative strategies identified in the paper, I might suggest that there be a more viable role for state education agencies in the ERIC System. Many smaller school districts do not have access to a university or the ERIC system itself and it seems that state education agencies could play a role here. They could assist in dissemination of what is available to ERIC as well as facilitating access of school district personnel to the system. An example is a system which is currently operational in the State of Kansas wherein, on a subscription basis, the state education agency provides a specified number of searches to school districts in the state. In addition, the state department provides a great deal of information to the subscribing school districts of the nature of ERIC and what it includes as well as appropriate information relative to descriptors and access. It seems to me that such a role for state education

1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 / Telephone: (703) 528-7875

agencies would be a way to increase the dissemination and use of practice oriented documents to practitioners, both teachers and administrators. The appropriate contact relative to the program I have described in Kansas is Dr. Richard K. Herlig.

I might point out that in an era of accountability there is a great deal of interest on the part of educational managers for practice oriented documents relative to management systems. The harried small world superintendent who is being hit over the head by state legislature or by his school board relative to accountability has a pressing need for "how-to-do-it" materials on various output oriented management systems. Thus the same situation you described relative to the field desire for instructional materials applies to management practices and could also be treated, it seems to me, through the application of standardization of the descriptors approach to this component of ERIC.

I hope you find these comments useful. Thank you for soliciting our input.

Regards,

Joe Sarthory

Joseph A. Sarthory
Associate Director

cc: Paul Salmon

JAS/em

Telephone (313) 764-9492

CAPS Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center
The School of Education, The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

August 19, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, VA 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

We have reviewed your comments on the ERIC system sent to us late July, and are pleased to send along our opinions as requested.

CODING- ERIC/CAPS supports the concept of coding document types as accurately as possible. We ourselves use some descriptor for each document and article we index so as to help our users to the utmost. It would be particularly useful to system users if we would parallel the list of leveling terms developed at one of our recent technical meetings.
We do not see the need for a completely separate system of coding--- ERIC contains a sufficient bank of legitimate terms with which we can code documents and materials.

PUBTYPES- In line with a new and more accurate way of coding, we would like to see a refinement of the Pubtypes now in use. We feel they should be refined so that one pubtype does not reflect several diverse document types. Additional ones might be added which would speak to evaluated programs and field-tested materials.

NEW DESCRIPTORS- Barring the use of new Pubtype categories, we would support the creation of a limited set of descriptors which would address themselves to instructional materials, such as: Field Tested, Validated, etc. (Some evaluative terms already exist in ERIC)

ABSTRACTS- Abstracts, particularly in the area of materials and programs, should include objective evaluative information if available in the document-- negative as well as positive. If a program or set of materials has been tested and found wanting with certain groups or under tested conditions, that information should be available to the user.

In regard to your request to use our Clearinghouse comments expressed in response to your April letter, please feel free to do so in any way you deem appropriate. Please make whatever use you wish of these comments as well. Thank you for your interest in helping to refine the ERIC system.

Sincerely,

Carol K. Jaslow

Carol K. Jaslow
Editor, ERIC/CAPS (for Dr. E. Benjamin, Assoc. Director, ERIC/CAPS)

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON RURAL EDUCATION
AND SMALL SCHOOLS

Box 3AP/Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003
Telephone (505) 646-2623

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

August 20, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger,

Enclosed are some comments by our staff concerning your report on curriculum material in ERIC. I thought they might be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

E. Edington mt

Everett D. Edington
Director, ERIC/CRESS

EDE/mt
Encl.
cc: Del Trester

August 14, 1975

Present: Dr. Edington; Betty Rose; Nellie; Margarita; Amelita

Subject: Reactions to the Steiger Report

Dr. Edington stated that he was pleased that someone was conducting such an investigation into the ERIC System and that they had canvassed two areas for their suggestions to the solutions of the practitioner's use of the System. The report is not final yet, we are to react to it before the suggestions are sent any further.

> Dr. E feels that the System was not designed for the practitioner, therefore we need to take a look at our methods and possibly refine them for the practitioner.

BRDR feels that the report was compiled by someone who was not familiar enough with the system to make adequate suggestions -- many of the suggestions were only possible if the entire System underwent major policy changes.

Many of the suggestions as to the items to be incorporated into the abstracts are already covered in our guidelines and we resent (one more time) being called to task for the mistakes of others.

REACTIONS FROM THE GROUP:

Extent of problem -- 9 out of 10 practitioners cannot make a concise statement of their problem before they make a search

The searcher is looking for materials that are not covered in the System because

1. Curriculum materials are copyrighted
2. Level III documents discouraged in System
3. Multi-media products not in system

It seems the author does not understand our system of cross-referencing.

Major objection to the BROAD Descriptors that are suggested for use in trying to make a search draw out a narrow subject.

Suggest the answer to the problem of retrievability can be solved with further interchange between linker agencies and the Clearinghouses (as we are now doing--workshops, etc.).

Dr. E noted that there were substantial variations in the descriptors submitted by the 16 Clearinghouses canvassed -- this is good and our decentralized system encourages this.

The recommendations made by the author seem to focus on the Elementary Secondary Education field only -- our system covers many other levels of education and we do not need to make changes that are not relevant to all.

Major concern over the abstract suggestions in that all of them are in the guidelines now and should already be incorporated into abstracts.

We would like a complete Resume Form used for the examples of incorporation of suggestions made by the author concerning indexing and abstracting.

Two line example does not cover all of the bases mentioned, nor the way they would be implemented.

Suggestions made concerning Pub Type do not clarify the problem, they complicate it -- such a Alpha-numeric system would be vast and there would be need for further specificity in each numeric classification -- never ending on encompassing the total problem.

ion: Pub Type needs to appear in RIE and a list of these Pub Types made accessible to users.

We do not want a separate system for instructional materials. Refined search methods would be more practical.

We definitely need scope notes on new terms that were suggested by the Clearinghouses, and feel there should be an evaluation of them.

In discussion of the Indicative and Informative Abstract, Dr. E feels that the Informative Abstract, for his use, is much more helpful.

Margarita pointed out that the Librarians at her workshops were very upset because, in many cases, [illegible] were much better than the documents.

Care must be taken in reflecting the document in hand.

MC is going to mention in her presentations that an abstract is not to be used for the purpose of referencing -- the document must be used.

We were very glad that we were given a chance to react to this paper; we feel perhaps a person familiar with the ERIC guidelines and overall policy (a third person) might be very valuable to the present team of researchers.

AH notes only

Reactions to Steiger Report

Before processing solutions can be devised, there are some major policy implications to be explored; among these are:

1. Is ERIC to become a one-stop resource? This involves questions concerning:
    a. high numbers of Level III documents
    b. advertising of commercial items
2. Is ERIC to change from a coordinate indexing system to an hierarchical system?
3. Are the abstracts to change from reflecting the document to become editorial and judgemental?

If the above questions are answered in the positive, then a further exploration of varieties of alternatives can be conducted, most of which are not addressed in the report.

If we are to adapt within the system we have (which I feel is the more logical), then many solutions can be found within our already existing guidelines. For example:

1. The present PUBTYPE could be cleaned up and made more useful.
2. The present guidelines for abstracting and indexing could be adherred to more strictly; the guidelines address almost every point raised in the report.
3. Some arrangement could be devised whereby the present PUBTYPE was reflected in RIE and on the fiche, with instructions on use by manual and machine searchers.

Questions Concerning the "Problem"

What is the magnitude of the "problem"? Is it necessary to completely overhaul the system to then find there are not that many curriculum and practitioner oriented materials available? Perhaps ERIC should not go it alone; there might ought to be some encouragement to get practitioners to write so ERIC would have something to input. ERIC/CHESS might have some thoughts on this, since the Social Studies Consortium sponsored such a practitioner project (nation wide) two years ago.

Concerns About the Report

The report and study could have been considerably strengthened and made more useful if the work had been done by two or more people rather than one. At least one or more of these persons should have been long-time users of ERIC to some depth. It would have been most useful to have both a computer searcher and a manual searcher involved. One person could have been a novice (like Steiger) to raise all sorts of blue-sky questions. The others would be aware of the specific requests of a variety of users.

The report strikes me as a blast at the clearinghouses. Since most elements in the report are in the guidelines, then evidently there is system slip-up. Without losing the concept of decentralization, perhaps Central ERIC should exercise more direction on specific compliance with the guidelines to the given clearinghouse (Mr. Marron's letters were harsh, but they were also unforgettable). I grow weary with always being brought to task for the malfeasance of a few.

The point should be made that practitioner prepared materials are usually the most slipshod we receive. Much of the information Steiger wants does not appear in the document. She seems to assume a perfectly written item designed to fit our guidelines. Rather, we must constantly adjust our guidelines to fit the document in hand.

The need for such a report concerns me. There appears to be a void in the managerial structure of ERIC. There ought to be an advisory committee of users, processors, and Central ERIC personnel. If such a committee functioned properly such "problems" as addressed in the Steiger report would be under review and consideration and thus would not (hopefully) be allowed to become problems of major proportion. Greater representation of user publics could be bro't to bear, also.

I was greatly annoyed that no sample abstracts were given. Introductory sentences addressed to some need or another do not make a complete, 200 word or less abstract.

Betty Rose
14-08-75

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701 · 512/476-6861

President
J. O. LANCASTER, JR., Superintendent
Ouachita Parish Schools
Monroe, Louisiana

Vice President
ALFREDO G. de los SANTOS, JR., President
El Paso Community College
El Paso, Texas

Secretary-Treasurer
RAYMOND FLOYD
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

ARLYNNE LAKE CHEERS, Professor
Secondary Education
Grambling State University
Grambling, Louisiana

JACK L. DAVIDSON, Superintendent
Austin ISD
Austin, Texas

GORDON FLORY, Executive Vice-President
Louisiana AFL-CIO
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

NORMAN FRANCIS, President
Xavier University
New Orleans, Louisiana

E. A. FREEMAN, Director
Manager Development
Olinkraft, Inc.
West Monroe, Louisiana

JOHN E. GRAY
President
Lamar University
Beaumont, Texas

ABNER HAYNES, President
Southwest Minority Corporation
Dallas, Texas

J. K. HAYNES, Executive Secretary
Louisiana Education Association
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

SISTER COLLEEN HENNESSEY, S.S.N.D.
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Galveston-Houston
Houston, Texas

ANNA B. HENRY
Consultant in Education
New Orleans, Louisiana

WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, President
Hogg Foundation for Mental Health
Austin, Texas

GLENN H. IVY, Research Director
Texas Research League
Austin, Texas

ARTHUR R. LAZO
Architect
Fort Worth, Texas

PAUL MOSES, Superintendent
Calcasieu Parish Schools
Lake Charles, Louisiana

W. H. PATTERSON, President
Boise Southern Company
DeRidder, Louisiana

VINCENT F. RACHAL, Director
Civil Service Department
City of Houston
Houston, Texas

DANIEL SAUCEDO, Director
Inman Christian Center
San Antonio, Texas

JOHN SIQUEIROS, Chairman
Radio-Television Department
University of Texas
El Paso, Texas

EDWARD W. STAGG, Executive Director
Council for a Better Louisiana
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Executive Director
JAMES H. PERRY

August 22, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Dr. James H. Perry, Executive Director of Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, has referred to me your paper, "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs." I am pleased to find that it addresses the concerns which our staff members have expressed.

Certainly we would agree that a descriptor for retrieving evaluated products is a necessity, and our preferences would be "validated programs" (p. 13) with a working definition indicated under the subheading EFFECTIVENESS (p. 22). In addition, we should like to suggest that some section, perhaps the SPECIAL ATTRIBUTES section, should address content validity. We also believe that the phrase "instructional principle or rationale" might profitably be enlarged to include "theoretical construct."

Sincerely,

Martha L. Smith
Director, Resource Development
and Planning

MLS/es

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY TALLAHASSEE 32306

Robert Manning Strozier Library
Science-Technology Division
19 August 1975

Dr. Jo Ann M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, inc.
6723 Towne Lane Rd.
McLean, Va. 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Your paper was quite informative; many of our users are interested in retrieving or excluding materials with a curriculum orientation. I am presently involved in computer searching of ERIC and other data bases through SDC, Lockheed, and the National Library of Medicine (Medline).

Medline has a system of checktags that is very valuable. Each document is indexed under as many of these terms as is applicable: Infant, Newborn (to 1 month), Infant (1-23 months), Child, Preschool (2-5 years), Child (6-12 years), Adolescence (13-18 years), Adult (19-44 years), Middle age (45-65 years), Aged (65 years and up). It is also possible to search under Review and retrieve all bibliographies or review articles. An ERIC search would be more satisfacory with a similar provision. At the present time one must use numerous descriptors to search on a grade level and this is a common question. Using the existing ERIC descriptors, here is a possible list of checktags. The list should be kept small and these descriptors would be applied to all articles to indicate either grade level or age of subjects. Infancy (to 23 months), Preschool (2 years to Grade 1), Primary grades (Gr 1-3), Intermediate grades (Gr 4-6), Junior high schools (Gr 7-8), High schools (Gr 9-12), Post secondary education, Higher education (Gr 13+), Adult Education. Also only one descriptor would be used to retrieve all materials in category L of Appendix C.

Many users request a specific type of paper. Your suggestion is interesting in this case although for computer retrieval I think too many search keys are required. We do get requests for teaching materials but also requests that would exclude this type of material. We also get requests for "programs that actually work" and evaluations of these programs. It is not possible to retrieve these at the present time.

There is a need for these improvements in indexing for the ERIC system. Hopefully, these could be included in the present indexes. It would be nice if AIM/ARM materials could be consolidated with RIE as frequently one must search both files.

A final suggestinn would be to have the tapes arranged in such a way that individual title words may be used as search terms. We find the system particularly slow to adopt new terms and sometimes the appropriate concept cannot be located. Your paper did not arrive until August 15.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Lois Burdick

The University of Northern Colorado
GREELEY, COLORADO 80639
Education Information Service

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink & Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Your paper is interesting and stimulating--and hits home. Serving both a university and several school districts, I have often felt the need of some distinction in the ERIC system between the requirements of the two groups (actually three if you count administration.)

Although I feel the best way to discriminate between "how to" and theory would be a complete separation of the system, I realize this is probably not feasible at the moment. Therefore, the idea of a standardized vocabulary, and codes, dealing with practioner-oriented materials appeals greatly to me. There are many times, finding an excellent document a week after a search had been mailed, that I feel like kicking the computer.

My question would be (dealing with a standardized vocabulary) how to make this change retroactive, or if there are any plans to do so--it would be a monstrous task!

Please keep us informed as to any decision made on this matter--it is a problem I feel needs a good--and quick-solution.

Sincerely,

Anne A. Powell

Anne A. Powell
Information Retrieval Specialist

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

COMPUTING CENTER

August 11, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger,

Perhaps I am not enough involved with the ERIC data to respond to your inquiry; but for what it is worth, I will. I am not an acedemic person or part of the Department of Education and am not so concerned about the data base. My job is at the University Computing Center. In 1973 the Department of Education in conjunction with the Appalachian Satellite Project acquired the ERIC tapes and some computer programs for processing the tapes and doing searches. Since the department was lacking in computer people, I agreed to implement the programs and help update the data files. ERIC seemed to have national overtones and I assumed that along with the data were some fairly sophisticated computer programs. As it turned out the programs needed changes before they would even execute and have proven to be very inefficient and expensive to run. Later I learned that there are many such computer systems floating around the country and most have the same problems. My suggestion is : How about some good computer software for doing searches?

Sincerely,

Lavine Thrailkill
Lavine Thrailkill
Manager R & D

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

STEIGER, FINK AND SMITH, INC.
EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

EAST COAST OFFICE:
6723 TOWNE LANE ROAD
McLEAN, VIRGINIA 22101
(703) 821-2717

WEST COAST OFFICE:
2254 CHELAN PLACE
LOS ANGELES, CA. [illegible]
(213) 874-805[illegible]

July 30, 1975

Dear ERIC User Services Specialist:

Enclosed is a paper developed for the Division of Dissemination and Resources of the National Institute of Education to serve as a springboard for discussion of ways in which ERIC services to practitioners might be improved. I would appreciate any comments or suggestions you might have concerning the problems outlined and the alternative solutions proposed in this paper. Please send your reactions to me at the Virginia address above by August 15 so that I can include your comments in my final report. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger

Ginn and Company

191 Spring Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173
Telephone (617) 861 1670

A Xerox Education Company

XEROX

August 19, 1975

Miss JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
2254 Chelan Place
Los Angeles, California 90068

Dear Miss Steiger:

Because your analysis of the ERIC system just reached me, I have not had time to address myself to the ideas in any depth. Still it seems to me that you advance a workable schema for enabling the ERIC system to focus more directly on documents pertaining to "Curriculum" and "Instruction".

My major concern in what you propose is the apparent separation of "audiovisual materials" from other instructional materials. I would think that any individual seeking, say, the ERIC listings under Instruction in Science would want to see any annotations of appropriate audiovisual materials included.

If I understand what you are proposing, this will not be possible -- or at least will require double listing.

Very truly yours,

James R. Squire

JRS:PB

James R. Squire

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

August 18, 1975

Mr. Charles Hoover
National Institute of Education
Office of Dissemination and Resources
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Chuck:

Attached are responses to Dr. Steiger's report on ERIC. I have responded to the report page by page to assist the people who may use our comments; in doing so, a few items are repeated.

Hope this is useful.

Cordially,

Bob

Robert W. Howe
Director, ERIC/SMEAC

RWH:lsh
Enclosures: ERIC/SMEAC Codes
Disinger and Lee Directory

cc: Catherine Welsh
✓JoAnn Steiger

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

August 18, 1975

Comments Re: The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs
July, 1975
JoAnn M. Steiger

1. Page 3, Findings

Paragraph 2 - ERIC does have many practitioner oriented materials. (This is not to construe that it should not have more!) The amount of material in the ERIC system varies in several ways: 1. Both RIE and CIJE contain many activities, units, guides, and other instructional materials, however, RIE has more of the larger retrievable materials (units, books, and guides) and CIJE has more of the smaller retrievable materials (activities); 2. the number of teacher oriented documents in various content areas varies by Clearinghouse philosophy, by actual production of materials in the field, by budget available for document processing, and by lack of emphasis in the ERIC system on a few areas (art, music, etc.). While there are variations, many fields-- science, environmental education, and mathematics have many materials in the files on most curricular areas. (There are some gaps, but these are far less severe than what is there. We would be willing to ship a computer "dump" of abstracts in our fields to make a point.)

Partitioning the file by subject areas (as we have done) would indicate what actually exists and where real gaps are.

2. Page 3, Findings

Paragraph 3 - We can give specific instructions on how to retrieve over 90% of the materials in our fields that are instructional materials, teaching guides, curriculum guides, or learning activities. Example: Elementary School Science and Instructional Materials or Science Activities or Learning Activities or Teaching Guides or Curriculum Guides would yield the bulk of material in the system; similar searches would do the same in Mathematics, Secondary School Mathematics and Science. I can narrow the search in various ways or broaden it also.

3. Need for... page 3

Hull and Wanger - We agree with their findings. Our surveys support their data.

4a. Retrieval... page 5

Paragraph 2, page 5 - Not generally true. Elementary School Mathematics, and Instructional Materials or Learning Activities.

This would yield primarily instructional materials with potentially a few research reports about the use of these. I feel that is not all bad. (Obviously I believe it has the benefit that a person may read some of the reports and decide not to use some of the materials for their particular groups.)

This would not narrow materials to grade 3. While it may be desirable to build that into the search system (and we do index things by grade if the materials are stated as such) what is grade 3 one place is not grade 3 some place else. What is grade 3 for upper ability students is not grade 3 for lower ability students.

4b. Retrieval... page 5

Paragraph 3 - We have codes we use and have suggested to ERIC several times. They have been in use at our Center (slightly modified) since 1966. As with any code there are overlaps; we have not found them to be serious.

5. Retrieval of... page 6

Paragraph 1 - A subsidiary problem. We agree. This is a problem. The problem, however, is not as simple as one might like to make it.

a. Most materials are unevaluated or tested.

b. Products that are evaluated or tested vary in the type of assessment they receive.

c. Most materials are available long before assessment data are available.

d. Most "tested" materials have been tested under certain circumstances. These conditions may be as important as knowing that the materials were tested.

We believe (1) there should be a way of indicating materials have been tested; (2) evaluative material when possible should be attached to the instructional material or referenced in the abstract and (3) there should be a way of adding evaluative data to the system as it accumulates on instructional materials in the system.

We also believe funds should be available to compile lists of programs and materials that have been tested that are in RIE and CIJE. We have attempted to do some of that in directories we have produced (See Disinger and Lee, enclosed).

6a. Standardization of Descriptors - page 8

We are not in favor of using only those five. Our document type code is much better. Paragraph 3 would not be true; it would not be simple to understand.

6b. Use of Pubtype Codes - page 9

Paragraph 2 - Books are not instructional materials? Many reference books certainly are and some people teach from several books.

6c. Page 10

Levels - agreed. That is what we try to do; but, we include a broader term like instructional materials (two descriptors or identifiers).

7. A Separate System... page 12

No! There are many advantages in having the two together, particularly if we hope teachers will consider research results in designing education programs. Reading an abstract about research frequently "turns on" the teacher to read the report and to use the ideas.

8. Retrieving... page 13

Something is needed but definitions are difficult. Also-- how do you amend the code or abstract when new data are available? The later data may be better or more useful. Data may also be obtained on a program previously coded as not evaluated. How do you amend?

9. Costs and... page 22

Very hard to obtain real data other than publication costs... and that is frequently the tip of the iceburg.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

ERIC

ERIC Higher Education

SUITE 630 / ONE DUPONT CIRCLE / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 296-2597

August 13, 1975

Dr. Jo Ann Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Town Lane Road
McLean, Va. 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

First let me say that I found your paper entitled "The ERIC System In Practitioner Needs" to be very interesting. Your points made concerning the indexing in practices and needs for improvement are valid. I think that most of the Clearinghouses would agree that more consistency is needed and greater effort should be made in the training of indexers/abstractors.

Speaking only for the Clearinghouse on Higher Education I have some trouble with the two basic problems that you stated at the beginning of your paper. In the area of postsecondary education, especially four year colleges and universities the use of the "traditional" program text and curriculum outline is not used. As you know college level courses are more apt to use a variety of materials, most of which are not easily identified as "curriculum or instructional materials". This is especially true for the upper and graduate levels.

The materials that do fit the description of curriculum materials are generally commercially produced and copyrighted. It has been a policy established by our National Board of Advisors not to cite this type of a material in Resources in Education. The reason for this is that this type of material is not considered fugitive and since the ERIC system has not yet received sufficient amount of funding to cover all materials related to education this Clearinghouse has dedicated itself to exerting its efforts in the areas that would have the greatest impact. It is felt that since the commercially produced materials have a desimination mechanism of their own and the major attention of this Clearinghouse should focus on materials concerned with higher education that do not have wide exposure and dissemination.

The second point that I have problems with is as a result of the lack of clearly defined material of higher education. Because of this lack of definition it is very hard for this Clearinghouse to identify and index the "instructional materials of various types and related practice-oriented documents". Are documents such as the National Commissions Report on Financing Higher Education ,books concerned with professional socialization or journal articles concerned with management techniques considered to be practice-oriented documents? As you can see at least for the higher education level, more thought needs to be given to defining what is considered instructional materials. Again let me say that I believe the ERIC system has a long way to go to acheive acceptable consistency in its indexing practices. Part of the problem, the training of indexer/abstractors, is being closely examined and training workshops are being planned for the future. The other problem of establishing the appropriate descriptor terms may never be solved at the satisfaction of everyone since a variety of persons with a variety of backgrounds and educational focus are involved with the indexing process.

Sincerely,

Jonathan D. Fife
Associate Director

JDF:ea

University of Pittsburgh

CAMPUS BASED INFORMATION SYSTEM

August 18, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

In reference to your letter of July 30, 1975 (which I received August 12th). I must first state that the bulk of our ERIC users are not utilizing the files as educational practitioners. Though a significant number of the users are actually teachers, even this group is predominantly utilizing the files for their own work as graduate students. Therefore, I hesitate to offer any specific suggestions concerning your area of interest, although I agree that much would be gained if the transfer of this wealth of research material into actual classroom usage could be expedited. (This is, as I am sure you know, a constant problem in every discipline).

Another factor which you may or may not realize is that I deal with the ERIC data bases only in the magnetic forms. The University has both an interactive (user on himself) and batch processing (information specialists) system. With all this negative background (I may be useless to you) I will share some thoughts that I have had concerning indexing problems that have evolved through usage of many magnetic data bases.

No system will ever be all things to all people and in spite of careful preliminary planning, most systems have to be changed. The custom of introducing change from a certain date forward is usually necessitated by fiscal restraints. Although this is always a handicap it is much worse with magnetic data bases since it is more difficult to educate the user to such a change (a user of magnetic data bases tends to consider the entire corpus of material not a volume per year as he will with printed material). At the present time many bibliographic magnetic data bases are either too large or will be too large within a few years for efficient searching. They are going to have to be divided and to date, opinion on division seems to favor subject division. My first choice therefore, is alternative three, a special data base. Hopefully the material already in the file and relative to the new file will be extracted and added to the new file.

LIS BLDG. PITTSBURGH, PA 15260 (412) 624-5218

I cannot choose between one and two because I see no hope of having them go retrospective.

I hope this is of some value to you.

Yours truly,

E. E. Duncan
Coordinator

EED/nc

SWRL
SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213

August 19, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
STEIGER, FINK AND SMITH, INC.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, VA 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Thank you for sharing your paper "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs" with us. It appears that you got caught in the crunch of the alchemy that transformed the R in ERIC from "research" to "resources." The transformation was easily handled by federal fiat, but is encountering difficulty in research, development, and practice in education.

Your findings that school personnel are chiefly interested in instructional materials and procedures confirms our experience and information in this area. But that ERIC is an efficient and effective mechanism for addressing this interest appears to be imposed by your NIE Order rather than by a reasoned formulation for meeting this clearly articulated practitioner (sic) interest.

ERIC was architected as a resource for research documents and has clear merits as such (although as the 1972-73 evaluations you cite clearly indicate, it can be expanded and economized as such). Products and practices are an entirely different matter than reports of inquiry; and experience in areas other than education confirms that they can be more efficiently and effectively treated by mechanisms completely apart from information retrieval systems such as ERIC.

Catalogs, handbooks, and "ad" journals are the conventional mechanisms for the information functions you address. Since products and practices are inherently less print oriented in substance, the "abstract" and "thesaurus" treatment that forms the core of ERIC is cumbersome, expensive, and ineffectual.

The MACOS incident is fresh enough in mind to make the question of how NIE can cooperate with rather than circumvent the private sector in forwarding the implementation and installation of well-developed educational products a matter of high import. For now and for the foreseeable future, the economics of education are such that the overwhelming majority of such products will be developed through R&D that is publicly sponsored. But there is no reason why ERIC need supplant established private capability for advertising, marketing, and distribution. I'm sure that this is no one's intent, but it is exactly what the boundaries of your study corral.

It may well be that informative resources such as the forthcoming catalog from NIE are justifiable initiatives of the federal government that will be acceptable to the private sector and useful to school personnel. But these can be produced for a fraction of the cost of the "alternative strategies" you present and without twisting ERIC far out of shape.

I hope that the "possibility that the abstracting guidelines described in this paper may form the basis for guidelines for writing abstracts of products developed by labs and centers" is remote. The notion of an abstract for a product is as anachronistic as the notion of an advertisement for a research report. Between the extremes of abstracts and advertisements, there are many communication genre that make good sense and that the educational R&D Community has been slow to adopt in coupling its efforts with that of school personnel. I'd support another NIE Order to set forth these as a follow-on to your present analysis.

Again, I appreciate your collegial courtesy in sharing the paper with us. The work appears competently done and is clearly reported. It simply seems to me that you were started on the wrong track which if pursued will become a needlessly and unnecessarily expensive and ill-conceived trip.

Cordially,

RE Schutz

Richard E. Schutz
Executive Director

RES:jl

ERIC RCS

August 18, 1975

Mr. Charles W. Hoover
National Institute of Education
Office of Utilization and Resources
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I am happy to have the opportunity to respond to the paper written by Dr. JoAnn Steiger. I think that studies such as Dr. Steiger's can be a great help in making the ERIC system meet the needs of its users. This study in particular is quite thought provoking. Her recommendations certainly merit consideration. My own reactions to her recommendations follow:

1. The need for access to educational product, program, and practice documents. As Dr. Steiger points out, the ERIC system should be designed to be most accessible and most useful to educational practitioners. I don't believe that there can be any question about this. However, it seems to me that there is some question about whether we should divide the ERIC file into "practitioner-oriented" and non-practitioner-oriented materials. Is there really a call for all ERIC "teaching materials," for example? Or is the call more accurately for some ERIC "teaching materials," in a given subject, at a given educational level, for a given population? To phrase this question another way, would it really be of any value to ERIC users to divide the file into "practical" and "impractical" documents? If such a division is desirable, could it not be done by means of presently available software, e.g., the exclusion of those documents indexed as dealing with "research" or "theory"? Why is it necessary to pull all product, program, and practice documents on a single command? (As you will note, these are questions and not answers. At present, I don't have the answers. However, these questions should be answered before we proceed.)

2. The need for access to evaluated materials.

   On this matter too, I seem to have more questions than answers. Although I can see the value of indexing documents by whether or not they are field tested or evaluated, it seems to me that there are some matters which we should consider first. Might not the indication by the ERIC system that a program has been evaluated be taken to mean that the program has the approval of USOE as an "effective program"? (If a program has been evaluated and found to be worthless, it would be assumed that

ERIC would reject it.) Would this be a potential source of trouble for ERIC?

3. The Standardization of product, program, and practice descriptors.

The recommendation to standardize descriptors here appears to be a matter of establishing mandatory form terms to correspond to the recently established mandatory leveling terms. As Dr. Steiger points out, the problem with this is that it will be difficult to distinguish between the use of such terms as form terms and other uses of them as subject terms. When will the descriptor INSTRUCTION mean that the document deals with techniques of educational practice and when will the use of this same descriptor mean instead that the document deals with research into the effectiveness of instruction or educational theory about the nature of instruction?

To return to a point which I have made earlier, why is it necessary to index a document with the descriptor INSTRUCTION when it could more accurately be indexed with the descriptor ENGLISH INSTRUCTION? Won't practitioners be more likely to use the latter term than the former? Will standardization really benefit the user?

4. Use of Pubtype Codes.

I would certainly agree that some refining of the Pubtype Codes is necessary. The duplication in Teaching Guides/Curriculum Guides is the most obvious area for improvement. The expansion of the number of codes is a matter which bears further investigation. I suspect that [illegible] the optimum number for ERIC users. The expansion of the number of codes might reduce their usefulness, since users would frequently have to use several code numbers to gain access to all the information they need. The proposed "general categories" codes might also be ill-advised, since they are based on the theory that all documents in the ERIC system would easily fall into one and only one, of the three categories. Frequently, of course, documents could fit all three categories.

It should also be considered whether an elaborate coding system (in this case, up to 99 Pubtype Codes paired with three general categories codes) would be too confusing for the average user of the ERIC system. What would be needed would be a way of eliminating users' confusion, not a means of adding an extra dimension to it.

5. Guidelines for Abstracting.

The guidelines which are suggested are, for the most part, quite good. However, I believe that they are already contained in the Processing Manual in one form or another. Perhaps it would be good to group these ideas separately in order to emphasize the importance of instructional materials; perhaps not. The only guideline which our Clearinghouse has not already implemented is the one regarding "Costs and Prerequisites." If cost information is included in an abstract, some indication should be made that the costs listed are applicable only for the specific location from which the document issued on the date at which the document was written (not necessarily the date when the document was published). Generalizations from such figures might otherwise be in error and ERIC might be held responsible.

I hope that these comments will be of some help in evaluating Dr. Steiger's study. I appreciate the difficulties which she had to overcome in preparing her study and I readily acknowledge that no perfect solutions of the problem of improving user access are possible. Dr. Steiger's recommendations are an excellent stimulus to further work in this area.

Sincerely,

Daniel Dieterich
Assistant Director
ERIC/RCS

DD/fb

ERIC RCS

August 28, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger:

I am enclosing a copy of my response to "The ERIC System and Practitioner Needs" for your information. I appreciate your efforts on behalf of NIE and ERIC. I think that studies such as yours are quite valuable in broadening our horizons.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich
Assistant Director
ERIC/RCS

DJD/fb

Enclosure

ERIC

Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 328-3870

Director Bernard O'Donnell
Associate Director Karl Koenke
Assistant Director Daniel J. Dieterich

COUNCIL FOR AMERICAN PRIVATE EDUCATION
1625 EYE STREET, N. W. (SUITE 1010)
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
(202) 659-3236

August 15, 1975

Dear Dr. Steiger:

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to look over the draft of the paper developed for the Division of Dissemination and Resources of the National Institute of Education. We very much appreciate your consideration of the needs of private school people as you consider ways in which ERIC services to practitioners might be improved.

For a number of reasons, which are not related to your study, private school people have had relatively little exposure to ERIC services. As a result, we have little from our experience to contribute to your study. On the basis of such limited experience as we have had, my best judgment is that for the most part what works best for public school people will work best for those in private schools.

There are, however, two exceptions to this general statement. While Messrs. Clemons, Chesley, Brandhorst, Houston, and I are working together to overcome this brace of problems, they probably should be called to your attention since it seems appropriate that they be dealt with in your report. First, there should be a clear mandate placed upon one or more clearinghouses to search out and process materials originating in or related to private pre-collegiate education. Second, appropriate descriptors should be developed to provide efficient access to such materials once they are incorporated in the data base.

Should you have any questions or see ways in which I could help, I would be happy to have you call on me.

Cordially yours,

Robert L. Lamborn
Executive Director

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc.
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

MEMBERS: THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH; FRIENDS COUNCIL ON EDUCATION; LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD, BOARD OF PARISH EDUCATIC
TIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EPISCOPAL SCHOOLS; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS; NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATION ASSOCIA
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR HEBREW DAY SCHOOLS; NATIONAL UNION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS; U. S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

P. O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302 · (303) 44

WICHE
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

October 2, 1975

Dr. JoAnn M. Steiger
6723 Towne Lane Road
McLean Virginia 22101

Dear Dr. Steiger,

Your letter and accompanying report were forwarded to me for answering. I realize that your deadline is long past, but will respond briefly to several aspects of the document in the hope the input will be useful.

Interestingly, the problem described is not one I have had to face in using the ERIC system. Our searches are rarely aimed at finding instructional materials. However, there are several points raised which are of interest to me as a librarian and others which are relevant at another level.

The statement of the problem (Findings, p. 2-7) is clear.

In the section Discussion of Alternative Strategies, p. 7-14, I strongly favor the use of Pubtype Codes, which would make it possible to zero in on several kinds of searches in addition to those for instructional materials, for example, certain kinds of reference materials. The two-level system seems cumbersome, but the problem described, (that of separating items which are instructional materials from those which are about such materials) needs to be attacked. It is not only in the case of instructional materials that this problem is met. I face it continually in my searches. It arises with any descriptor which can be used to describe a kind of material, and one can never be sure one will retrieve the materials per se, or articles about them.

Finally, I think the guidelines presented in the 3d section are excellent and would greatly improve the system.

Hope you succeed in getting improvements you need in ERIC - I think it's wonderful and I don't know how I would live without it, but it can certainly use improvement - what can't?

Sincerely yours

JoAn S. Segal
Librarian.